Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-219
Wednesday
15 November 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-219 *November 15, 1989*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

General on Defense Sufficiency, Reductions *[TASS]* 1
Strategic Rocket Forces Commander Interviewed *[TASS]* 1
UNGA Drafts Anti-Nuclear Weapons Resolutions *[TASS]* 1
U.S.-Soviet Nuclear Test Talks Viewed *[Vedenyapin on Moscow Radio]* 2
People's Deputy Questions Nuclear Test Reduction *[Moscow TV]* 2
Soviet-Dutch Arms Talks Held in Moscow 13 Nov *[TASS]* 3

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Socialism's Ability To Meet Challenges Questioned *[PRAVDA 11 Nov]* 4
Exhibition Confirms CEMA Achievements *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Nov]* 5

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

TASS Reports Gremitskikh Press Briefing 14 Nov 6
Bulgarian Leadership Changes 6
Air Raids in Afghanistan 6
Swedish Stance on Baltics 6
Asian-Pacific Cooperation 6
Roland Dumas' Visit, PRC Border Talks 7
Spokesman on Developments in El Salvador *[TASS]* 7
Primakov Discusses Relations with U.S., Europe *[Moscow TV]* 7
International Military Policy Forum Previewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Nov]* 12
International Youth Forum Opens in Moscow *[TASS]* 12

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Secretary Cheney Opposes NATO Program Cuts *[IZVESTIYA 13 Nov]* 13
Washington's 'Downbeat Mood' on Summit Noted *[IZVESTIYA 15 Nov]* 13
U.S. Reaction to East Europe Events 'Sober' *[PRAVDA 15 Nov]* 15
Baker Warning on Bloc Instability Noted *[IZVESTIYA 13 Nov]* 16
Sees Changes *[IZVESTIYA 15 Nov]* 16

Northeast Asia

Yakovlev, Delegation Continue Visit to Japan 16
Delegation Members Listed *[PRAVDA 13 Nov]* 16
Correspondent on 13 Nov Activities *[Moscow International* 17
More on Yakovlev Talks With Emperor *[Moscow TV]* 17
Remarks on Meetings With Emperor, Kaifu *[Moscow International]* 18
Yakovlev Urges Stable, Dynamic Ties *[Tokyo KYODO]* 18
Stresses Importance of Ties *[Moscow International]* 18
On Prospects for Peace Treaty *[TASS]* 19
Speaks at Tokyo Reception *[Moscow International]* 19
USSR Not To Send Troops Abroad *[Tokyo KYODO]* 20

Sub-Saharan Africa

Commentary Previews Namibian Elections *[Chernukha on Moscow International]* 20
IZVESTIYA Views Situation in Ethiopia *[3 Nov]* 21
Ethiopian Peace Prospects Assessed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Nov]* 22
Shevardnadze Talks With Ethiopian Ambassador *[PRAVDA 12 Nov]* 23
'Joint Report' on Sao Tome Delegation Visit *[IZVESTIYA 9 Nov]* 23

East Europe

Yakovlev Says Reunification Up to Germans *[Tokyo KYODO]* 24
Portugalov Says Wall Has 'Lost Main Function' *[Hamburg BILD 15 Nov]* 24
Yeltsin Welcomes Opening of GDR Borders *[Hamburg BILD 15 Nov]* 25
Vremya Correspondent Interviews GDR's Modrow *[Moscow TV]* 25
GDR Central Democratic Block Meeting Reported *[TASS]* 26
PRAVDA Updates GDR Situation *[15 Nov]* 26
Gerasimov on Impact of GDR Developments *[BBC]* 27
Government Congratulates GDR's New Premier *[PRAVDA 15 Nov]* 28
Bulgaria Seen Aiming for Real Perestroyka *[PRAVDA 15 Nov]* 28
Reportage on Helmut Kohl's Visit to Poland 29
Discussion With Jaruzelski *[PRAVDA 14 Nov]* 29
Signs Joint Statement With Mazowiecki *[TASS]* 29
On Unification, Europe's Future *[IZVESTIYA 15 Nov]* 29

West Europe

French Foreign Minister Dumas Winds Up Visit 30
Talks to Shevardnadze on Mideast Peace *[TASS]* 30
Meeting With Shevardnadze, Lunch *[PRAVDA 15 Nov]* 30
Meeting With Gorbachev *[PRAVDA 15 Nov]* 33
On Problem of German Reunification *[Paris Radio]* 34
14 Nov Departure *[TASS]* 34
Mitterrand Telephones Gorbachev 14 Nov *[Paris Radio]* 34
To Meet Gorbachev After Summit *[Paris Radio]* 34
Soviet-French Ties Transcend Bilateral Framework *[IZVESTIYA 14 Nov]* 34
FRG View of GDR Travel Decision Questioned *[Moscow Radio]* 35

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Economic Reform Conference

Further on All-Union Economic Reform Conference 37
Slyunkov, Abalkin Speeches Reported *[PRAVDA 14 Nov]* 37

Supreme Soviet Session

PRAVDA Report on 10 Nov Presidium Session *[11 Nov]* 42
Fedorov Defends Lenin's Stance on Role of Party *[Moscow Radio]* 42
Moscow TV Relay of 14 Nov Supreme Soviet Session 43
1600 GMT 43
1722 GMT 44
1811 GMT 46
1916 GMT 46
2045 GMT 48
TASS Reviews 14 Nov Supreme Soviet Session 49
Stalin's Forced Resettlement Declared Illegal *[TASS]* 49
Councils To Discuss Language, Citizenship Bills *[TASS]* 50
Councils Hold Sessions 15 Nov *[TASS]* 50

Political & Social

Gorbachev Addresses Student Forum on Perestroyka *[TASS]* 50
Stresses Socialism *[Moscow International]* 50
Discusses 'New World Order,' GDR *[TASS]* 51
Gorbachev Address Cited *[Moscow Radio]* 51
Vorkuta Strike Affects Cherepovets Plant *[Moscow International]* 52
Striking Vorkuta Miners Submit Demands *[TASS]* 53
Miners Reportedly Want To Submit Case to ILO *[AFP]* 53
Miners' Situation in Donbass Reported *[Moscow TV]* 53
Further on Estonian Supreme Soviet Session 54
Resolution on 1940 Events *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 15 Nov]* 54
Election Law Debate *[IZVESTIYA 12 Nov]* 55
ETA Protests Supreme Soviet Report *[Tallinn Radio]* 56

Latvian Supreme Soviet Session Resumes 10 Nov 56
Picketing Reported *[PRAVDA 11 Nov]* 56
Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact Assessed *[Riga Radio]* 57
On Marking Independence Day *[Riga Radio]* 58
Latvian Interior Minister Interviewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 10 Nov]* 58
Lithuanian Party Leaders 'Summoned' to Moscow *[Vilnius International]* 59
Sajudis Reports 10 Nov Riot, Curfew in Kishinev *[Vilnius Radio]* 59
Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Session Reported *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 11 Nov]* 60
Lithuanian Communist Party Draft Program Cited *[TASS]* 60
Lithuania To Operate First Youth Radio Station *[Vilnius International]* 61
Lithuanian Party, State Appeal on Crime *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 20 Oct]* 61
Brazauskas on December Party Congress *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 20 Oct]* 62
Gomel Party Obkom Replaces First Secretary *[PRAVDA 29 Oct]* 63
Exarch to Belorussia Appointed *[TASS]* 63
Extremist Activities Increase in Ukraine *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 18 Oct]* 63
New Evening Paper in Ternopol *[Kiev International]* 64
Moldavia: Proclamation of Gagauz ASSR Illegal *[IZVESTIYA 15 Nov]* 64
Moldavian People's Front Blamed for Violence *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 15 Nov]* 65
Georgian Demonstrations Against Conscription Noted *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Nov]* 68
Armenian Catholicos Vazken Comments on Anniversary *[Yerevan International]* 70
Armenian-Language Computer Program Developed *[Yerevan Radio]* 70
Yerevan External Broadcasting Viewed *[Yerevan International]* 71
Assyrians Form Society in Armenia *[ARMENPRES]* 71
Return to Classical Armenian Orthography Sought *[ARMENPRES]* 71
Azerbaijan Upgrades Relations With Allied Republics *[Baku Radio]* 72
Azerbaijan's 9-Month Socioeconomic Results Noted *[Baku Radio]* 72
Baku Reports on Border Trade with Iran *[Baku Radio]* 72
Turkmen Drug Traffickers Sentenced *[TASS]* 73
Kazakh Party Central Committee Holds Plenum *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 73
Kazakh Supreme Soviet Calls for Nuclear Test Halt *[Moscow Radio]* 73
Elects New Officials *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 74
Republic, Local Boundary Disputes Aired *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 2 Nov]* 74
Further on Baklanov Visit to MiG Plant *[IZVESTIYA 4 Nov]* 76
Zaykov, Others at Technicians' Congress *[Moscow TV]* 77
Andrey Brezhnev Interviewed on TV *[Moscow TV]* 77
Attitudes to Restoring Volga Republic Discussed *[IZVESTIYA 10 Nov]* 78
Plant Official Analyzes Exodus From CPSU *[PRAVDA 31 Oct]* 80
Soviet 'Inferiority Complex' Must End *[PRAVDA 14 Nov]* 81
State Bank Warns Against Forged Bills *[TASS]* 82
Thinking Behind New Draft Law on Leave Explained *[IZVESTIYA 11 Nov]* 83
Start Date for Contempt of Court Law Slated *[PRAVDA 12 Nov]* 83
Contempt of Court Law Published *[PRAVDA 12 Nov]* 83
TV Chief Editor on Replacement for Vremya Program *[IZVESTIYA 11 Nov]* 84
PRAVDA Reporter Banned From Chelyabinsk Forum *[PRAVDA 30 Oct]* 85
Media Chief Views Moscow Radio Changes *[IZVESTIYA 28 Oct]* 85
Views of New Novosibirsk Leader Solicited *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 12 Nov]* 86
Lithuanian Party Official Views 'Radical Renewal' *[TIESA 26 Oct]* 88

Agricultural

Livestock Wintering Causes Concern 90
Preparations Viewed *[PRAVDA 10 Nov]* 90
Milk Shortages *[Moscow TV]* 91
Agricultural Report for 6-14 November Period *[Moscow Radio]* 91

Scientific

'Mir' Cosmonauts Continue Experiments 92
Work Proceeds *[TASS]* 92
Semiconductor Experiment *[Moscow International]* 92
IL-96-300 Assembled, Tested at Voronezh *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 1 Nov]* 92

General on Defense Sufficiency, Reductions

LD1111140589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0715 GMT 11 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 11 Nov (TASS)—The process of reducing the Armed Forces is directed toward bringing them to a level of defense sufficiency, Major General Vadim Makarevskiy wrote in an article published in the latest edition of the weekly NOVOYE VREMYA.

According to his calculations, if the proposals of the Warsaw Pact countries at the Vienna talks on the reduction of conventional armed forces in Europe are accepted, then the overall number of the USSR's Armed Forces will be reduced by around 1.4 million people and will comprise approximately 2.858 million people. The general thinks that under such conditions the transfer of the Soviet Armed Forces to a professional basis, with the careful selection of personnel, is an objective necessity in the near future. In his opinion, during the course of a definite period of time, the permanent—even if conscripted—contingent going into the Army and Navy not on a 2- or 3-year contract but on a 4-, 6-, 8-year contract will expand more and more. The opportunity for selecting people as the numbers of the Armed Forces are reduced will grow. Those who do not get into the Army on this basis will be able to serve their required 2-3 years in specific units, including medical and construction units.

At the same time, the law on universal military duty must be preserved, the author of the article notes. However, it is possible to use it selectively. That is, everyone suitable for military service has the duty to serve, but of those with military obligations, only the best should be selected for the Army and for a definite time period, on a contract of 4-6-8 years, not less. The remainder will, in the necessary numbers, be dispatched to units where such a high qualification is not needed for 2-3 years. The mobilized reserve for war time will also be accumulated to the necessary extent. Although it is being reduced by 1 and ½ to 2 times, this will nevertheless guarantee the deployment of Armed Forces in numbers sufficient for defense.

Strategic Rocket Forces Commander Interviewed

LD1511092589 Moscow TASS in English 0845 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS—The Soviet Strategic Rocket Forces (SSRF) together with the strategic navy and air forces are the major elements of the Soviet military power, SSRF commander told TASS on the eve of the 30th celebrations of the Soviet Rocket Forces and Artillery Day on November 19.

The Soviet deployment of nuclear missiles and weapons in the late forties was promoted by the military threat from aggressive forces of imperialism, Army General Yuriy Maksimov said.

The creation of a Soviet nuclear shield was historically necessary, he added. Maksimov however, emphasised that the initiative to radically reduce Soviet nuclear weapons came from the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Strategic Rocket Forces are armed with state-of-the-art weapons and military hardware, the general said.

The Soviet Union has enough missiles to maintain strategic military parity.

The sum-total of Soviet nuclear carriers has remained constant, at a level of 2,504 units, since the signing of the SALT-2 Treaty, he said.

Having stressed that the protection of the life and peaceful work of the Soviet people imposes the greatest responsibility, the commander said that the Soviet Union does not clamour for more security and will not agree to less security.

"This is why the Soviet Union cannot allow another power to have the military advantage," Yuriy Maksimov concluded.

UNGA Drafts Anti-Nuclear Weapons Resolutions

LD1111074589 Moscow TASS in English 0733 GMT 11 Nov 89

[Text] New York November 11 TASS—The United Nations General Assembly's [UNGA] First Committee (Political, Security and Disarmament) on Friday [10 November] endorsed a package of draft resolutions on the non-use of nuclear weapons and the prevention of nuclear war.

The General Assembly believes that the solemn statements made by the two nuclear powers about their pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons are an important step on the way to reducing the risk of nuclear war, one of the draft resolutions says.

The Assembly expresses hope that the other nuclear states will make similar statements.

The draft resolution welcomes the entering into force and implementation of the Soviet-American INF Treaty as well as the measures taken by the two states to reduce the risk of war.

Another draft resolution points out to the need to take effective measures to avert nuclear war, and again reaffirms that multilateral and bilateral talks on nuclear issues should be mutually supplementary and promote one another.

"There can be no victors in nuclear war and it should never be fought" is the phrase which was quoted in two of the draft resolutions endorsed on Friday.

U.S.-Soviet Nuclear Test Talks Viewed

LD1311030689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2300 GMT 12 Nov 89

[Genadiy Vedenyapin commentary]

[Text] The leader of the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-U.S. talks on limiting nuclear tests has stated that in the past year, great progress had been attained which gives hope that the talks will be completed before the Soviet-U.S. summit at the end of spring and start of summer next year.

Paul Robinson announced that the text of the protocol which will set the verification mechanism in motion is currently being drafted. In Robinson's view, the last meeting between U.S. Secretary of State Baker and USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Shevardnadze resolved a number of major questions which thus created the basis for completing the work on the protocols of the treaties. Here is a Mayak commentary. At the microphone is commentator Gennadiy Vedenyapin.

[Vedenyapin] I shall remind you that in the first chapter of the Moscow treaty on the prohibition of nuclear tests in three areas, the USSR, the United States, and Great Britain undertook to continue the talks with the aim of achieving a permanent prohibition of all nuclear tests, including underground ones. Well, more than 25 years have passed, and alas, it has so far proved impossible to attain this goal, although our country proposed to prohibit nuclear weapons tests back in 1955.

Well, in August 1985, the Soviet Union, as is known, opted for a unilateral moratorium which lasted no more and no less than 569 days. Unfortunately, having found no support on the part of the United States, our country was obliged to renew underground tests. A new advance in resolving the task set was all the same achieved: In September of the year before last, during a meeting between the foreign ministers of the USSR and the United States, an accord was reached that full-scale talks on the ending of nuclear tests would start after all, and would take place in three stages.

The first stage is the preparation of an improved monitoring system and, as you have heard, this work is now by all accounts coming to an end. It has been proven that possibilities for monitoring nuclear tests do exist. But as far as our country is concerned, it has repeatedly stressed that we are ready at any time, on the basis of reciprocity, to end the carrying out of nuclear explosions and to do everything in order to achieve the complete prohibition of nuclear tests.

It is evident that now, when the practical implementation of the treaty on medium and shorter-range missiles has started, that is, the first step towards the elimination of nuclear weapons has already been made, a favorable atmosphere is also created for reaching an accord on the prohibition of nuclear texts. This, in turn would doubtless help to bring a halt to the proliferation of this kind of weapon in the world.

It is true that one is set on guard by the fact that during the hearings in the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, the disinclination of the U.S. Administration to go further than partial limitations on nuclear explosions and to strive to achieve a complete and universal prohibition of nuclear tests was in effect again confirmed. It is considered in Washington, as previously, that they are necessary, necessary, allegedly, to ensure the reliability of nuclear restraint and to increase security.

It is true that the view of the administation did not meet with support at the hearings. The chairman of the committee, Pell, formulated his view thus: My point of view with regard to the matter of a universal and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons differs substantially from yours, and as a senator, I hope that we will conclude such a treaty at the end of the day.

Well, it remains only for us to hope that this healthy point of view will ultimately prevail.

People's Deputy Questions Nuclear Test Reduction

LD1111224489

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1400 GMT on 11 November, in its "Planeta" program, carries a 40-minute segment entitled "People's Diplomacy and the Common European Home," featuring journalist and international affairs specialist Mikhail Ozerov and V.V. Zagladin, adviser to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and chairman of the Supreme Soviet Committee on European Security and Cooperation.

After discussing the ways in which people exert pressure on their governments to achieve their goals, particularly peace and disarmament, and the need for Soviet people to have more contact with the outside world to create mutual trust between countries, it is noted that Soviet people's deputies are asking direct questions of the country's government. Video shows Deputy Olzhas Suleymenov asking about the actual kilotonnage of nuclear tests carried out in the USSR, claiming that on 8 July there was a test of a 20 kilotonne bomb; on 2 September there was a test of a weapon of unknown size; on 4 September there was a test in the order of 60 kilotonnes; and on 19 September there was a further test which was announced as being in the order of 75 kilotonnes but was in fact, Suleymenov claims, more than 150 kilotonnes. The deputy points out that these tests took place despite the fact that Council of Ministers Chairman Nikolay Ryzhkov had promised the Congress of People's Deputies that there would be fewer tests and that they would be limited to 20 kilotonnes.

Zagladin ends by summing up the prospects for people's diplomacy.

Soviet-Dutch Arms Talks Held in Moscow 13 Nov

LD1411010189 Moscow TASS in English 2344 GMT 13 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 14 TASS—Soviet-Dutch consultations on curtailing and limiting armaments were held in the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs on Monday [13 Novermber]

The Soviet delegation was headed by Deputy Foreign Minister Viktor Karpov, the Dutch delegation by Director of the Department of Atlantic Commonwealth and International Security A. Ettema.

During the consultations a broad range of questions concerning disarmament and security in Europe came under discussion.

Special attention was given to nuclear disarmament and the Vienna talks on cutting conventional weapons in Europe.

Socialism's Ability To Meet Challenges Questioned

PM1411145789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
11 Nov 89 Second Edition p 6

[Article by Prof Ranko Petkovic, chief editor of the Yugoslav journal MEDJUNARODNA POLITIKA: "Socialism: Response to Challenge of 21st Century"]

[Text] Belgrade, Nov—The 20th Century, the century of great national liberation and social revolutions, among which a special place is held by the October Revolution, is coming to a close. The October Revolution holds a special place not only because the first socialist country in history consequently appeared on one-sixth of the world's surface, but also because it served as the starting point for the world socialist process which has swept the shores of almost every continent.

Yes, we pay tribute to the Great October Revolution. Yes, today all progressive mankind is celebrating this glorious date. But it is precisely today that we must ask ourselves the following question. Will the generations that witnessed the triumphal formation of socialism in the 20th century not witness its decline on the threshold of the 21st century?

Socialist society's difficulties began at the point when it became obvious that, despite the euphoric proclamations and numerous promises, socialism had proved itself unable to guarantee the kind of democratic freedoms and economic achievements that would make people's life in socialist society better than life in a number of developed capitalist states.

The main bulk of the "responsibility" for this inadequate economic development and standard of living could be ascribed to objective historical facts: Socialism first appeared in undeveloped countries. So it would seem to be clear that the main culprit responsible for socialism lagging behind is the inefficiency and low productivity of the economic model.

A large share of the "responsibility" for the restriction of basic democratic freedoms could be ascribed to the real or imagined threat of internal counterrevolution and external armed intervention—although it must now be clear that the main repsonsibility for the many weaknesses in socialist society must be borne by the bureaucracy. The representatives of this bureaucracy have tried and are still trying by every means possible to retain their power and their privileges.

Attempts at halfhearted reforms or cosmetic changes have given a certain boost to the development of socialism but, as a rule, have had no lasting success....

In the eighties it became obvious that the inevitable hour of truth had struck and that, if vigorous, bold, radical reforms were not made in socialist countries, capitalism would be the force to deal socialism a painful blow. Or the other scenario: Socialism would become obsolete.

Despite the differences stemming from historical, geopolitical, national, and other factors, in all the socialist countries that have now taken the path of radical reform the main attention has been focused on measures to broaden democracy and enhance the efficiency of the economic system. While working to give increasing scope to the mechanisms of the market economy and political pluralism, the socialist countries are embarking on a path that will help to overcome one of the main "infantile diseases" of communism. Namely: To regard what belongs seemingly to the trappings of the capitalist social order not as "alien bodies" under socialism but instead as universal values common to all mankind. Values which ultimately broaden democratic freedoms and the freedom of the market—and all this should not be seen simply as the economic and ideological foundations of the capitalist system.

It must be said that capitalism is not developing into socialism, although it does sometimes implement socialist ideas in practice. Just as socialism does not have to turn into capitalism simply because it is trying to use capitalist experience.

It goes without saying that neither restructuring in the Soviet Union nor the reforms in Poland or Hungary are pursuing the aims of restoring capitalism. That option would be possible if the leadership of the communist parties in these countries were to be taken up by "agents of capitalism," to use the once popular Stalinist term. But, on the contrary, we all know that both restructuring and the reforms in the East European countries have been undertaken with the aim of renewing socialism using those methods and in those conditions which offer this possibility.

Society now well understands that it is impossible to save socialism with projects based on outmoded ideological and political stereotypes, as their practical application is responsible for the present serious difficulties in socialist countries.

I will also say something else: Now, when the weapon of the "cold war" has been rejected, socialism and capitalism are no longer deadly enemies that have sworn to destroy each other. The demilitarization and deideologization of international relations is the reality of today. The world is becoming increasingly interdependent. The antagonism and military rivalry between socialism and capitalism are losing their significance.

The new processes and changes in the world which have been given a strong boost by M.S. Gorbachev's policy of restructuring, glasnost, and new political thinking include the transition from a bipolar to a multipolar world, from "cold war" to cooperation and the scientific and technical revolution. Now, a "place in the sun" is not guaranteed by force of arms, the winning of new territories, or the expansion of spheres of influence, as has been the case in the past, but by economic and technological development. This is an epochal change! It is having a real impact on the state of peace on earth.

If big changes had not been made in the world arena recently—of which the events in the socialist countries are one manifestation—it seems evident to me that the Western bloc would have forcibly tried to "reap" the fruits of its triumph. While not forgetting the influence of those political forces in the United States and other Western countries that would like to exploit the difficulties being experienced by the socialist countries to impose the West's military-strategic and other influence on them, one can nevertheless assume that the events now taking place in the world, the socialist countries included, will help to break down the barriers of mistrust and move the global interests of all mankind into the foreground.

Socialism's future now depends exclusively on its readiness and ability to become rapidly and sufficiently involved in the processes of economic and technological development throughout the world.

While thinking at this time about the October Revolution, all socialist countries must not forget about implementing far-reaching reforms, particularly in the economy. Reforms with which we must respond to the challenge of the 21st century.

Exhibition Confirms CEMA Achievements

PM1411140189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Nov 89 First Edition p 3

[Own correspondent A. Dolgikh article: "International Exhibitions in the USSR. Time of Change"]

[Text] Not so long ago France's LE MONDE published an article by a certain Erik Izrayelevich [name as transliterated] entitled "Split Empire." It was about CEMA. Although the writer's views were clear from the headline, I will nonetheless cite a few of his arguments: "While the developed countries of the West are relishing their achievements in Brussels, in the Moscow building housing the CEMA—the so-called 'open book'—working commissions have been cut and vain attempts are being made to reach agreement on the organization's future.... Serious differences exist between countries which were previously called the 'socialist community'...."

I have to disappoint those who share the French newspaper correspondent's views. CEMA continues to be a solid economic alliance of the fraternal countries. Everyone who visited the USSR Exhibition of National Economic Achievements 26 October through 6 November, where the exhibition-fair "Implementation of the Comprehensive Program for the CEMA Countries' Scientific and Technical Progress" was held, could see that for themselves. Here is what Lutz Zenker, director of the GDR exhibit, told me just before the exhibition ended:

"The exhibition is unprecedented in its purpose. There has been nothing like it in CEMA's 40 years. All that is best and most advanced is represented here. These are not just things that have been brought into production, but also projects. We are very happy with the results of the exhibition and we assess them as a first successful step on the road to systematic information and commercial activity to introduce the developments of our comprehensive program of scientific and technical progress."

One is struck by the quality and quantity of the exhibits. There were more than 1,300 of them. That is why a computerized information center which could locate the desired information within seconds was essential. Incidentally, the exhibition was split into five sections—"The Introduction of Electronic Equipment into the National Economy," "Nuclear Power," "Biotechnology," "Comprehensive Automation," and "New Materials and the Technology for their Production and Processing."

It should be noted that the economic reforms currently under way in most socialist countries are also affecting their activity within CEMA. The problem of establishing direct ties between farms, firms, and scientific organizations has made itself fully felt. In the opinion of specialists, a number of tasks needs to be resolved in this area. Specifically, more effective and efficient forms for implementing direct ties should be utilized—to wit, the creation of joint ventures and firms, exchanges of scientific and technical information under license, and so forth. All this will make it possible to rapidly introduce new technology, to rapidly produce new output, and to rapidly market it.

During the exhibition many future direct partners were "paired off." Thus, around 20 cooperation agreements were concluded with GDR enterprises alone.

Priority tasks include the creation of a joint data bank for scientific and technical information. Here, too, complete mutual understanding was achieved. It was decided to set up such a bank no later than next year.

Here we should also note the need for, if we can put it this way, a common CEMA computer. Incidentally, this could take the shape of the supercomputer demonstrated at the exhibition by scientists from Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, and our country. It has a potential of 1 billion operations per second....

Critically assessing the path that has been traveled, the fraternal countries are seeking new opportunities to solve the problems of their development and the further improvement of their economic, scientific, technical, and cultural cooperation. The exhibition-fair held at the USSR Exhibition of National Economic Achievements is proof of that.

TASS Reports Gremitskikh Press Briefing 14 Nov

Bulgarian Leadership Changes

LD1411133989 Moscow TASS in English 1324 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 14 TASS—"The recent changes in the Bulgarian leadership are regarded in the Soviet Union as part and parcel of the processes in socialist countries to overcome deformations of socialism, to put socialism's creative potential into full play and to make it more humane and democratic," Yuriy Gremitskikh, the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman, said at a briefing here today.

Gremitskikh commented on the decision passed by the November 10 plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Bulgaria, which elected Peter Mladenov as general secretary of the party instead of Todor Zhivkov.

"For its part, the Soviet Union is prepared to continue strengthening the traditional Soviet-Bulgarian friendship, to seek jointly new more effective forms of interaction between our two countries and peoples," Yuriy Gremitskikh stressed.

Air Raids in Afghanistan

LD1411154889 Moscow TASS in English 1526 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 14 TASS—Afghan armed opposition units lost about 30,000 men in the past nine months, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing here today.

Recalling that tomorrow marks nine months since the completion of the Soviet troop withdrawal from Afghanistan, the spokesman said that the aspiration of certain forces in the United States, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia to bank on the solution of the Afghan issue by military means attests to their underestimation of popular support for the Afghan Government and the combat ability of the Afghan Armed Forces.

Gremitskikh dismissed the recent American press reports that Soviet planes were carrying out raids inside Afghan territory to hit armed opposition concentrations as "contradicting the reality and fabrications".

Swedish Stance on Baltics

LD1411155689 Moscow TASS in English 1516 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 14 TASS—The Soviet Union praises Sweden's recognition of the legitimacy of the Baltic Republics' entry into the USSR, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing here today.

Gremitskikh was commenting on Swedish Foreign Minister Sten Andersson's remarks made during his trip to the Soviet Baltic Republics within the framework of an official visit to the USSR.

The minister reaffirmed that Sweden does not consider the Baltic Republics Soviet-occupied territories.

The Soviet spokesman recalled that the May 30, 1941 agreement between the Governments of the USSR and Sweden on settling mutual property claims related to Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia amounted to Swedish recognition of the Baltics' incorporation into the USSR.

Andersson's latest remarks are additional proof that any outstanding problems, especially those related to ethnic policy, demand a well-considered and balanced attitude, Gremitskikh pointed out.

Asian-Pacific Cooperation

LD1411232789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1400 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 14 Nov (TASS)—At a briefing today, Yuriy Gremitskikh, first deputy head of the USSR Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate, described the Canberra conference of ministers of foreign affairs and foreign trade of the twelve states of the Asia-Pacific zone as "a remarkable event in the life of this region."

It is stressed in documents adopted on the results of the forum that the broadening of economic cooperation should be implemented with due consideration being given to such principles as ensuring the development of the whole region, strengthening open international trade, and acknowledging the socioeconomic diversity of its member-states.

Under the influence of the general positive changes taking place in the world, Yuriy Gremitskikh noted, the Asia-Pacific zine is also undergoing an intensification of integrational processes and an improvement in relations between many of the countries situated there. The trend toward an activization of trade and economic interrelations in the region is of considerable potential.

At the same time, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said, this potential can only be fully revealed if the multilateral cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region does not lead to isolation of a group of states and the formation of closed [zamknutyye] organizations.

"It is hoped in the Soviet Union that all the states in the region will be able to participate in the activities of the consultative forum which was founded in Canberra, without any discrimination," Yuriy Gremitskikh emphasized. "The USSR, consistently adhering to the Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk initiatives, is, for its part, ready to make a constructive contribution to the development of regional cooperation."

Roland Dumas' Visit, PRC Border Talks

LD1511000389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1510 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Excerpts] Moscow, 14 Nov (TASS)—Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh gave a press briefing here today. [passage omitted]

Giving a preliminary assessment of the French minister's visit to the USSR, which is ending today, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs spokesman said that it represents an important landmark in the contacts between the foreign ministers of the two countries and that it is passing in a constructive, friendly, and businesslike atmosphere. A meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Roland Dumas, France's minister of foreign affairs, who is here on an official visit, will take place this afternoon. [passage omitted]

Continuing the briefing Yuriy Gremitskikh said the Soviet-Chinese group of diplomatic and military experts on questions of the reduction of armed forces in the regions adjacent to the border between the two countries and the strengthening of trust in the military sphere started its work Monday in Moscow. This group has been set up in accordance with the agreement reached during the meeting between the supreme leaders of the USSR and the PRC.

Having touched on the subject of the stay in the USSR of the delegation of the Finnish parliamentary foreign affairs committee, headed by its chairman Markus Aaltonen, Yuriy Gremitskikh noted that "this visit makes a weighty contribution to the development of interparliamentary ties, which are an integral part of the development of interstate relations between the USSR and Finland." Replying to a question regarding the USSR's attitude to the referendum on the complete abolition of Switzerland's defense forces, which is planned for 26 November in that country, Yuriy Gremitskikh said that "the ideal of complete disarmament is very close" to the Soviet Union. In so doing he stressed that the referendum is an internal affair of Switzerland itself. Commenting on the recent statements by U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, who accused the USSR of subsidizing supplies of armaments to the El Salvador rebels, the Foreign Ministry spokesman pointed out that these claims "are insufficiently close to the truth".

Touching on the visit to the USSR by a Panamanian delegation, led by Minister of Planning and Economic Policy Gustavo Gonzalez, which is taking place at the present time, Yuriy Gremitskikh said that in the course of the meetings and talks the sides are discussing the state of and the possible prospects for the development of Soviet- Panamanian trade and economic contacts.

Spokesman on Developments in El Salvador

LD1311155589 Moscow TASS in English 1547 GMT 13 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 13 TASS—The Soviet Union favours a peaceful political settlement to the Central American conflict. It will continue to assist in the search for a solution to the crisis in the region and in El Salvador in particular, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said today.

He was commenting on the latest developments in that country where, judging by the latest reports, the political situation and hostilities between the opposing sides have come to a head. There are reports of the shelling of densely populated residential areas in San Salvador and other cities.

A state of siege and a curfew have been imposed and constitutional guarantees of civil liberties have been suspended.

Behind this is a difficult situation, which has characterised life in El Salvador for many years, the spokesman said.

But whatever the underlying causes of the current rise in violence, it will, given the actual alignment of forces in the country, give no advantages to any of the opposing sides and only take a heavier toll of human life.

One can see that these developments are also capable of frustrating the incipient negotiating process and hopes for a peaceful political settlement, generated by the recent meetings between Salvadoran Government officials and the rebels in Mexico and Costa Rica.

In the present situation, fraught with the most serious consequences for a peace settlement in El Salvador and Central America as a whole, the opposing sides must exercise special restraint and reason, give up attempts to "outplay" one another, strive for a reasonable compromise, having the interests of the Salvadoran people in mind. The Soviet spokesman said that in these conditions all members of the international community, above all the parties directly involved in the Central American settlement and states with interests in the region, have to show maximum restraint in assessments and actions so as to prevent extra complicating elements from being introduced into the situation.

Primakov Discusses Relations with U.S., Europe

LD1211213789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1600 GMT 12 Nov 89

[From the "Political Tribune" program; studio interview with Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, by Political Observer D.D. Biryukov; date of interview not specified—recorded]

[Text] [Biryukov] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, since you have just returned from a trip to the United States and

moreover, as a high-level leader, my first question is connected namely with that trip: One can suppose that your meetings and conversations in the United States were frank. Why is it that today one can ascertain a quite definite turnabout on the part of the highest U.S. leaders toward a positive approach with regard to restructuring processes in our country? Do they think that we, having changed our system, will become the same as them? Do they expect humility from us because of growing dependence on Western investments and technologies, or do they all the same believe that we will solve our complicated problems and that we will be stable partners in all respects?

[Primakov] Well, I think that we do not, in general, have to choose between those three things which you have raised, because there is a range of considerations. There is no uniformity, and I think that one should not paint the entire picture of public opinion and the view to be found among the United States' leadership with just one colour. But I think—and I derived this from a conversation with President Bush and with Secretary of State Baker—that the United States' leadership now chiefly, of course, adheres to the viewpoint that we are not intending to change, that we will follow our line. However, we are indeed becoming reliable partners because we are giving up many of those manifestations of our policy which have not justified themselves; which took place in the past, and which contradicted reality and the interests of the world community. I think they understand that this is our strategic path. As a matter of fact, the possibility of the normal development of relations with the United States is based only on this understanding, but this does not mean at all that there aren't individuals there which follow or adhere to completely different positions. This is utterly clear. There are also those who think that we will indeed fall into technological dependence. Perhaps there are also those who think that we will come around to capitalism, although of course this is in general an absolutely far-fetched version. We have our own values which we will defend, and which have already justified themselves.

But the way in which you raise straight forward issues shows your understanding that we have dropped behind in the technological sense, and there I would also introduce some corrections. You see, even those who understand that we have lagged behind—and we have indeed lagged behind, both in the economic, in the scientific and technological sense, and even in the scientific and technological—but many understand that there can be a turning point here. There can be a turning point, an entirely real turning point, and moreover, real in the 1990's. Many connect the possibility of a turning point—in the United States I had occasion to come across such a point of view—with the conversion which will take place and develop in 1990. I have in mind the conversion of the military industry. You see, in general in the military industries, in military production, we have reached—we have been forced to reach—a comparable level to that of the United States. Here we have an accumulation of brains; there is a very great potential here. If conversion is implemented in the military industry—and those who are really in touch with the situation and who are really in touch with the fabric of the development of international relations understand that this will be the case—this is a priority option which has the most probable possibilities for development in the 1990's. They think that here there is not only assistance to the Soviet Union, but that there is also cooperation here which can give a great deal to the United States.

[Biryukov] So, if we can we will now return to our European continent. The processes taking place in the socialist countries of Europe leave no one indifferent. Well, probably the leaders of our country have all the information on what is taking place, about all the processes. What kind of conclusions are being drawn in connection with this? Are there analogies with events in our country, or do any kind of differences exist based on principle?

[Primakov] Well, I'll begin with the United States. There they very often put the question: Are you repudiating the Brezhnev doctrine? Have you repudiated this doctrine for good? Well, in general among Americans—and they are inclined toward such doctrinaire thinking—they think that both they and all others, so-to-speak, function on the basis of some kind of worked-out doctrines which are approved after appropriate discussion, and so on. Of course, in our country we did not have any kind of Brezhnev doctrine as such, as a doctrine, but speaking about the system of behavior in relation to socialist countries, this system of behavior has cardinally changed now. The system of attitudes toward socialist countries has, in my view, cardinally changed after perestroyka, too.

Well, what is this change based upon? First of all, unlike what used to be the case in the past, we no longer think that we are all but holding God by the beard and that we are closer to the truth than anybody else, solely proceeding from the fact that we have travelled a considerable way, so to speak, and have accumulated greater practice than any other socialist country. We have departed from a mentor-like attitude toward other socialist countries, and this is very correct, in my view.

Then there is another point, too. You see, earlier we used to think that a single model of socialism existed both on the vertical and on the horizontal plane. What do I mean by vertical and horizontal planes? On the vertical plane, we used to believe that the command and administration model that was developed during the years of the civil war and that jumped over the new economic plan and was revived in subsequent years following Lenin's death—that this model has a universal importance for all time, so to speak, and that this is precisely what socialism is. On the other hand, we thought that this model had universal importance for all the countries and that this, and only this, was socialism. And if someone changed his attitude toward this model and took cognizance of other opportunities inherent in the socialist way

of constructing society we thought that was an apostasy from socialism. Now we have become far less dogmatic and far less single-mindedly dogmatic, I would say. We have broken off with that altogether. And, therefore, this theoretical base of a totally different attitude toward the processes that are taking place in socialist countries has made its appearance. Yes, there are principles which unite all the socialist countries but there are specific features of development based on the peculiarities of the history that has been lived through, on traditions, interests, and national features, if you like. Then, properly speaking, we think now—and this is absolutely right—that such concepts as the market, commodity-money relations, the banking system, and so on are not so to speak purely social concepts, whether capitalist or socialist. They can both serve development, and therefore, our relations have changed.

There is a third point I would like to add. We are firmly building our policy now, and this is absolutely obvious. This has been stated many times by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and this has indeed been laid down in the foundation of our political course. We recognize that all peoples and countries have the right to choose, regardless of what model they already chose earlier for their development. This is a right of free choice, a right of free choice. This applies both to socialist countries and, incidentally, to capitalist countries, too, something many in the west do not like very much. But this is a position we uphold. Therefore, the things that are now taking place in East European socialist countries, and the things that are taking place in China, too—I think we regard them calmly and with understanding of the matter. There is only one aspect where we could be worried: If some or other events could result in destabilizing the international situation.

[Biryukov] Well, this is not only....

[Primakov interrupting] ...But by themselves, they will not result in that, only if somebody interferes in the whole thing. So this is the position regarding the events in socialist countries.

[Biryukov] Well, and in what concerns analogies, to be more specific, is it necessary indeed that all countries should go through the same (?path)?

[Primakov] No, of course not. If you also have this question, which is latently present, so to speak, does our perestroyka affect the events that are taking place over there?

[Biryukov] Yes.

[Primakov] Yes, it does, of course, of course it does. Perestroyka is now affecting all the sides of the development of public life and the whole international situation. It is affecting them in the most direct fashion. But this does not mean at all that through perestroyka we impose some line or policies of our own, and so on. We are implementing perestroyka for ourselves, primarily for ourselves. But, objectively, it has its influence, of course.

[Biryukov] Since we have mentioned the term itself, perestroyka, which excites us very much these days, one hears it all the time, both in official pronouncements and in normal conversations. It is always being used; I would very much like to look into the future. What is your forecast for 1990? Will it be a year of stabilization of the situation or will we have to pave a way until we reach some agreed starting point when the economic and political system that is now being created really begins to operate?

[Primakov] Well, you see, it seems to me that the year 1990 must of course be a turning point. In what respect? We are currently discussing in the Supreme Soviet. You are talking mainly about the political system, are you not?

[Biryukov] Yes.

[Primakov] We in the Supreme Soviet are now. But I would not even confine things to the political system: I would also speak about the economic reform. The Supreme Soviet is currently discussing a whole system of laws, draft laws, which are to be adopted. These include a draft law on ownership, on land and the use of land, on lease relations, on relations between the centre and loca, er, and the republics. All this is very important. This, as a matter of fact, is the legal skeleton, if you like, of perestroyka. You know it is also very important in many respects to make the processes of perestroyka irreversible. Previously before the various measures that were introduced were generally often connected with the activity of one person or a group of persons. At present this is being put onto a lawful basis, onto a legal basis. This is why I am able to say that this is the legal skeleton of perestroyka. Many people want us to adopt all of these laws as quickly as possible. We want also that very much. Believe me, in the Supreme Soviet we want that, and we are working very hard; overall people write letters to us saying adopt these things more quickly, adopt them instantly, and so on and so forth. Many of these laws cannot be adopted without discussion by the whole people. Therefore, they go for their first reading at this session; thereafter they will go forward for discussion by the whole people and will be adopted article by article following discussion by the whole people. This has to last a long time and is a serious matter, as they say. It is not even so much the fact that it has to last a long time as that it has to last forever. It is obvious the adoption of these laws will indeed be carried out during the first half of the 1990's. That will create a very powerful legal base for the processes of perestroyka. It seems to me, however, that one cannot put one's trust in these laws alone. This is an important part, but it is not the only part. If I were to talk about the economy, for example, look at the gap that we find ourselves with now. So far up to today the economic reform has affected the money in circulation; but what about the material side of things? Supplies of essentials to the enterprises, you understand—raw-materials, manufactured component parts and means of production in general—it is still the old system that is in existence. As far as bringing both of these

aspects into line with each other is concerned, of course the laws will also have an effect here, but it is perfectly clear nothing can be done by merely talking about different forms of ownership without saying that in parallel with this a true market in the means of production must be created and that this market must also be created with the help of reforming the prices mechanism.

I think that in this respect many steps will be taken in the 1990's, and much is to be expected from raising the issue which is now to take place at the forthcoming Congress of People's Deputies. I am thinking of the congress which is now already known to commence work on 12 December. At the Congress, the Council of Ministers will present a report to determine the stages of perestroyka, something that hitherto has been in very short supply, in very short supply. Because sometimes, you understand, we have acted in a sporadic way, as it were, although we did have a concept of perestroyka, we did have the concept, there is no doubt about that. A concept has to be implemented in real deeds of some kind; it is this succession of real deeds that determines the way in which this process falls into stages. The phases, the stages, of this process were not determined to a sufficient degree. For that reason it was difficult even to talk to the people on many questions, because well, let me take, for example, Britain or Sweden. Today Britain and Sweden have a very high standard of living, particularly Sweden, where it is higher, even, than in Britain. After World War II there was a considerable period when they had to draw in their belts, even. It was clear this had to be done so that such and such a thing, such and such a thing, and such and such a thing could be implemented subsequently. This successive aspect must be brought home to the people, the successive nature of the measures. In this respect I am expecting a very great deal from the report which will be presented by the Council of Ministers and which is now being worked out with the help of the country's best economic minds. Therefore there must be a turning point of some kind, and elections, of course. Of course there must be elections, elections which will now take place in all links, which will be held at this level for the first time in a truly democratic way and which will create a foundation, a most real foundation, for this new political system of perestroyka.

[Biryukov] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, we have talked about the processes taking place in the socialist countries of Eastern Europe, about analogies and prospects; however, we have a whole set of issues involving perestroyka within our enormous country—interrepublic relations, and the processes that are taking place in the republics. What is your assessment of the prospects in this sphere in the immediate future?

[Primakov] That is a very complex question, you understand. We want and it is necessary for the country to have a precise idea of what the political leadership wants and seeks to achieve. On the one hand, everything must be done to eliminate the distortions that took place in the past, distortions in relations between the center and the republics. These are serious distortions. You cannot wave them aside just like that. Many of the problems which are now arising in the republics have their roots, so to speak, in these distortions. They were engendered in objective terms by these distortions. On the other hand, of course, we want to create a true federation. Hitherto, we have been living virtually in a unitary state. We have not yet lived really as a federation. We have to do what is needed so that we can begin to live as a true federation, and only thereafter tackle certain questions or raise certain problems which do not fit into that life as a federation. Then it will be clear whether a problem is a valid problem or not.

In the republics now, you understand.... [Primakov changes thought] Yes, and another question, of course the national economic complex of the Soviet Union must be preserved. If we divide up the economy and distribute it among the nationalities, it will be a departure not just for what has already been achieved in our country but from commonsense, too. In fact, it is already being proved by the whole world community that a real, viable, and effective economic complex is created precisely by integration. Sometimes people tell us that we have to go through this stage, that we must first divide ourselves up and then afterward, supposedly, join together. But that is putting the question in the wrong way. If mankind is already showing that an integrational model exists which is indeed bringing success—Europe, for example, after 1992 will create a Common Market—and despite the pull toward their own sovereignty by all the states, so to speak—some to a greater extent, some to a lesser extent in Europe—but nevertheless the frontiers, the economic frontiers between the states will be leveled—the economic frontiers, I would like to stress. In our country they tell us not to pay any attention to all of that, let's first of all divide ourselves up. That is putting the question in the wrong way. There must not be any extremism here at all, but at the same time one has to combine, firmly and absolutely, this struggle against extremism. It's not even a struggle, it's the ability to demonstrate the bankruptcy of this extremism. One has to combine this persistently with the need to eliminate those distortions which—I want to say again—took place, and indeed there are some manifestations which still take place between the center and the periphery, between the republics.

[Biryukov] We know that the majority of your citizens are in favor of perestroyka. Nevertheless, we know that there are those who are its enemies, although many say outwardly that they are in favor of perestroyka. What do you think. Can one speak about any real forces within the country for whom destabilization of the situation is to their advangate? If there are such forces, how would you define them—extreme left-wingers or on the contrary, right-wingers? Do they have international support?

[Primakov] You know, I would not define them either from the viewpoint of being left or from the viewpoint of the conservative right, if one can put it this way.

[Biryukov] By this, however, you confirm that they do exist.

[Primakov] Undoubtedly they exist. There are such forces which like.... (Primakov changes thought] There motto is the worse, the better, perhaps. You put the question this way. There are such forces. But I have to explain why I would not define them on the basis of their positions. I would prefer to define them on the basis of functions, not positions. I think that for these forces, these or those positions are ways toward attaining some goals.

I would difine two such goals. The first goal is, of course, to curtail the processes of restructuring and to return to the point of departure, as the saying goes. There are those, though not many, who would like this to happen. There are others who regard their ambitious plans as of paramount importance, who are striving, on the whole, for power, too, if you like. But I think that many of them, if not the prevailing majority of such figures, lack any drawn-up and clearcut program which would show their ideology, if you like, or philosophy....

[Biryukov interrupting] Yes, but nevertheless....

[Primakov, interrupting] All this is geared only to the purpose of coming to power.

[Biryukov] But they are, however, the loudest in advocating perestroyka.

[Primakov] Well, it is the case that sometimes they advocate perestroyka. Therefore, I would like to reitarate that I would not stick to such definitions as extreme left or extreme right. I simply think that the worse the better is dear either to those who indeed wish to go back or to those who seek popularity, the so-called populists; to gain popularity, to move to the forefront, to find some support, and, perhaps, I think, to come to power, too.

[Biryukov] What about international support?

[Primakov] No, not in the international aspect. I think that the main international support.... [changes thought] On the whole, I would like again to come back to the beginning of our conversation. The picture in the west is not uniform. One cannot speak about international support as of something that has already taken shape and completely on the same basis, so to speak. International public opinion is varied but the prevailing majority of international public opinion supports the processes of perestroyka in our country and those forces, primarily—I want to stress this especially—supports the line and the course being implemented by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, under his leadership. This is a unanimous opinion now, more or less unanimous or, to be more precise, the prevailing opinion in the West. But it is seen as the only serious one.

[Biryukov] I see. Here is my last question, Yevgeniy Maksimovich. If one compares your views and opinions of, say, 2 years ago and those of today, in what direction have they evolved—toward optimism, pessimism, hardness, or moderation?

[Primakov] You know, definitely toward optimism; yes, toward optimism. And even the work of the Supreme Soviet inspires one with optimism. Look how we started. We started, on the whole, at the congress. That congress was necessary, I think, in order that these democratic forces and democratic ideas that have overwhelmed society could burst into the open. All this was necessary but often it took the form of rallies. When, at first, we received the Supreme Soviet from the congress, we received it from the congress, in the very beginning. [as heard] If one follows the evolution of the Supreme Soviet, one could come to the conclusion that now it has turned into a body which works in a very constructive way and which really works. This evolution that the Supreme Soviet has undergone in a short time inspires one with optimism. This is the country's main legislative body and legislative activity, as you yourself know, is now one of the main ones and one of the main courses of the process of perestroyka. I have become a far greater optimist.

Your second correlation is that of hardness and moderation, so to speak. I would not put the issue this way. It is not hardness or moderation that matter. Now I am convinced much more than before that the issue of firmness, resolutness, and flexibility should be raised dialectically, in conjunction with flexibility. There must be firmness and resoluteness in creating a law-governed state, and firmness and resoluteness in ensuring that, so to speak, all the members of our society observed the law. We cannot move anywhere without that. We want to have a law-governed state, and we want to have it because we have no other guarantees, so to speak.

Some people talk about totalitarianism, others talk about there having to be some kind of authoritarianism. Lord preserve us. That's not what we're talking about. Authoritarianism isn't capable of being the sole guarantee; the guarantee can only be the law-governed state, where the laws, the constitution, where the constitution, which if it operates, even if here and there, so to speak, there are one or two articles in it which have not been sufficiently worked through, which have not been brought sufficiently in line with life which developes very quickly—but nevertheless it operates, and at the time when it does operate it has to be observed. [sentence as heard] Otherwise it will be chaos. Without any doubt determination is needed here. But it must be combined with flexibility. Firmness, determination, combined with flexibility, because we must indeed use all situations in order to unite all supporters of perestroyka in a single whole. The consolidation of our society has to be achieved and can be achieved through combining this determination with flexibility. I think that that is precisely the line that is being implemented by the Politburo.

[Biryukov] Thank you.

International Military Policy Forum Previewed

PM1411143789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Nov 89 First Edition p 1

[Interview with Major General N.A. Chaldymov by unnamed own correspondent: "New Thinking and Military Policy"—date and place unspecified, first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] An international scientific conference entitled "New Thinking and Military Policy," in which eminent Soviet and foreign scientists, politicians, and military men will participate, will be held in Moscow 14 through 16 November. One of the collective organizers of the conference was the V.I. Lenin Military-Political Academy. Our correspondent asked Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Major General Professor N.A. Chaldymov, chief of the academy's philosophy faculty and deputy chairman of the conference organizing committee, to talk about the coming event.

[Chaldymov] It is already obvious to all of us that there is no sensible alternative to dialogue, cooperation, and movement down the road of reducing the threat of war in order to preserve peace and ensure that it is possible for mankind to exist and develop. But the path to the creation of a universal security system guaranteeing stability, taking account of mutual interests, and rejecting fruitless confrontation is inconceivable without dialogue and an opportunity for representatives of different political systems to meet and discuss frankly and in detail problems of concern to mankind. The forthcoming conference should serve precisely this purpose.

Its organizers include the USSR Philosophy Society, the European Group for Scientific Research into the Army and Society, the Military History Institute, the USSR Peace Fund, the USSR Cultural Foundation, the USSR Academy of Sciences Philosophy Institute, and the CPSU Central Committee Social Sciences Institute.

The conference will last 3 days. After the plenary sessions, which will hear the main reports, work will be continued in six sections.

I can say that the conference participants will be representing more than 30 countries, including the United States, Britain, France, the FRG. Japan, the Netherlands, India, the SFRY, the GDR, the CSSR, Greece, and Italy. Soviet military scientists and specialists will also be widely represented at the conference.

International Youth Forum Opens in Moscow

LD1111151289 Moscow TASS in English 1347 GMT 11 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 11 TASS—More than 120 entries have come in to the organising committee of a constituent conference of the Association of International Youth Initiatives from various Soviet and foreign independently-acting organisations—ecologists, geological prospectors, medical students and representatives of internationalist movements.

The conference opened here today.

"Our purpose is to promote the realisation of the ideas of new political thinking in relations among the peoples of our country and abroad and to help independently-acting organisations and individual members to implement their own projects and ideas," said A.Filatov, chairman of the organising committee.

Among the projects that have been sent to the conference is a suggestion to organise world days of Russian youth—a meeting at which representatives of Russian young people from all continents could discuss prospects for cooperation in the fields of the economy, culture and tourism.

United States & Canada

Secretary Cheney Opposes NATO Program Cuts

PM1511111389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Added to the Arsenal"]

[Text] New York, 12 Nov—On Saturday the U.S. Navy took delivery of its new nuclear-powered aircraft carrier "Abraham Lincoln."

This is the U.S. Navy's 15th aircraft carrier. It was built at the Newport-News shipyard which is separated by only a narrow strait from the Norfolk naval base (Virginia). U.S. Defense Secretary R. Cheney delivered a speech at the aircraft carrier commissioning ceremony held at the base. While noting that a process of rapid and profound transformations is under way in the USSR and other Warsaw Pact countries, the head of the Pentagon at the same time expressed himself against any cuts in NATO military programs. "This is not the time to give up any of our commitments," Cheney claimed.

The new aircraft carrier took 5 years to build and cost $3.4 billion. Its displacement is amost 100,000 tonnes and the length of the hull 333 meters.

Washington's 'Downbeat Mood' on Summit Noted

PM1411163989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent A. Shalnev report: "What Is Being Said in the United States. On the Eve of the Soviet-U.S. Summit Meeting"]

[Text] New York—An analysis of George Bush's vocabulary reveals a curious detail: Whenever the President speaks of his administration's foreign policy he uses, more often than not, different variations of the word "prudent" [printed in English] which can be translated as "cautious, far-sighted."

This word abounds especially in Bush's speeches, statements, and interviews touching, in one way or another, on the topic of Soviet-U.S. relations or the even broader topic of East-West relations. The president made no exception to this rule during his conversation with journalists last Friday. Asked whether he was worried in case the fast pace of events in East European countries could result in instability on the continent, the White House chief replied: "I think that this is why I always use the word 'prudent.'"

The amazing point here is that the president admitted in the very same interview: "Bearing in mind not only yesterday's events (in the GDR—A.Sh.) but also the sum total of events (in East European countries—A.Sh.), I am convinced that the changes are genuine."

If such confidence exists, why bank on prudence and caution? Why is it that the administration still lacks a clear-cut strategy for building relations with the Soviet Union and its allies? When will the administration be ready to embark on specific actions which would reflect its own "new thinking" and its own new perception of the socialist world?

Rumor has it that the Washington embassy of a country friendly to the United States rewrote six times a draft memorandum to its government, setting out to define and analyze the essence and orientation of U.S. foreign policy. Following the sixth attempt the embassy staffers, who, one might assume, had quite reliable access to sources of trustworthy information inside the Washington administration, decided to take a little more time over this report: Providing an accurate picture of White House foreign policy proved to be beyond their capacity.

This is just one of many episodes which confirm that even now, 10 months after coming to power, the U.S. Administration is still busy shaping and formulating its foreign policy, still preferring to be a "responding" administration, in other words an administration trailing in the wake of events rather than anticipating them.

Some people might raise an objection by referring, for example, to the fact that the organization of the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in the Mediterranean was initiated by Washington and personally by President G. Bush, who sent the appropriate proposal to M.S. Gorbachev. Without in any way diminishing the importance of this meeting, I must draw attention to a fact to which attention is also drawn by many political commentators in America itself. In their opinion, the U.S. side conceived the meeting in such a way that it would not be worth expecting it to produce any specific results in the form of fundamental accords.

It seems to me that even a purely "get-to-know-you" meeting, at which no agreements are concluded, can produce quite a lot. Personal contact between top leaders and the exchange of information at their disposal can lay the foundations for very productive advance in the future. One could imagine that the administration and the president personally have a special need for information at present. The White House and the departments involved in foreign policy feel extremely uncomfortable because they lack a proper idea of the depth of events now occurring in East Europe, and above all of how events might develop in the future. The information arriving in Washington is at times so chaotic that it precludes the detection and evaluation of underlying trends.

Be that as it may, when George Bush proposed an "informal" meeting to M.S. Gorbachev he proceeded from, among other things, the urgent need for totally trustworthy information. This is one of the motivations. Here is another: The 10 months of the Bush presidency have proved quite fruitless. Whereas Reagan, during the same period in power, had succeeded in getting two exceptionally important economic laws passed, which played a considerable role in overcoming the decline

which America was experiencing at the time and in ensuring conditions for an economic revival which has lasted 7 years now, Bush has nothing to boast of. THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE pointedly referred to President Bush as "Fisherman Bush," who spent virtually his entire August vacation fishing but caught almost nothing. In domestic policy, the President has tasted the bitterness of having a series of his initiatives fail in Congress. In foreign policy, he has become the target of sharp criticism for failing to act properly during the Panama crisis.

What's true is true: Bush's popularity rating among Americans remains very high—on the order of 70 percent. But, according to NEWSWEEK, White House Chief of Staff John Sununu recently warned his subordinates that this level cannot be maintained for long. Unless, of course, the proper measures are taken. I think that from the White House standpoint the Mediterranean summit is such a measure. The summit should allow the president to discard the growing burden of accusations made, among others, by allied governments, that he has been passive in foreign policy and is not conducting an active dialogue with the Kremlin. The summit may give Bush the breather he needs to continue the process of shaping and formulating his foreign-policy line.

There is no doubt that the summit is important if only because it is taking place. But I am quite frankly confused by the White House's downbeat mood. The impression is that the Bush team is preparing for the Mediterranean summit fully resolved to avoid any agreements at all costs. As Marlin Fitzwater, the president's press secretary and one of his most trusted officials in the present hierarchy, said, "if the Soviet leader makes a dramatic proposal our answer will be: 'Many thanks for your views, we will study them in due course.'"

It is one thing when nobody is expecting or hoping for any results. That is understandable: There are many problems, they are complicated, and they cannot be solved in the space of 2 days. But it is quite another matter when you strive to prevent any results, even if an opportunity to achieve them arises. This is undoubtedly influenced to an enormous extent by the "Reykjavik syndrome": The U.S. foreign-policy establishment still has terrifying memories of the way that, in the fall of 1986, former President Ronald Reagan almost agreed to total nuclear disarmament after succumbing to "Gorbachev's charm" at his meeting with the Soviet leader in the Icelandic capital.

The call for "No repetition of Reykjavik!" has been heard quite loudly in Washington recently.

But those making this call are ignoring, either deliberately or through misunderstanding, one key point: George Bush is not Ronald Reagan. The current president has immense foreign-policy experience, whereas the former president had none. Reagan was a man of emotion, a man of the moment; he was able to make decisions in a flash if he was in the right emotional mood. Bush is exceptionally cautious in everything and does not make decisions until all his main advisers have expressed their opinions and until he himself has a thorough personal understanding of the question on which a decision needs to be made.

I think that the White House itself is clearly aware of these differences and clearly realizes that Reykjavik can hardly be repeated in the Mediterranean—but even so, calls for increased caution are being made there, too.

Actually, caution has been shown about the summit since the very beginning. The Bush proposal sent to the Kremlin in July was wrapped in particular secrecy: Just four people knew about it apart from the president. Those who were "in the know" have not been named. All we know is that Defense Secretary Cheney and CIA Director Webster were not among them. Admittedly, we can try to work out who the foursome were. They were probably Secretary of State Baker, White House Chief of Staff Sununu, and National Security Adviser Scowcroft. They are all Bush's closest advisers. He spends most of his worktime and many of his days off in consultations with them. Who was the fourth? Either Vice President Quayle—which is somewhat doubtful, bearing in mind Quayle's limited influence on administration affairs—or, more likely, Scowcroft's deputy Robert Gates, who is considered the main White House Soviet expert and a highly authoritative force in the elaboration of Washington's foreign-policy positions.

The team which Bush will take to the Mediterranean will be very small: just 20 officials. Admittedly, they will include the president's closest advisers, but among them there will be virtually none of the experts who could produce highly accurate on-the-spot analysis of any proposal that might be made by the Soviet leader or of any situation that might arise and immediately suggest possible responses to the president. The absence of such experts in the U.S. delegation testifies in general to the White House's reluctance to "work for results" [rabotat na resultat] from the Mediterranean meeting.

What is the reason for this? I think that there are two main factors: Bush's inherent caution, which has already made itself apparent a number of times in the first 10 months of his presidency, and the increasingly noticeable disagreements in the upper echelons of the administration on the question of what the White House's Soviet policy should be. Officially the administration denies that there are any disagreements. But it is not so hard to see that Bush's foreign policy team is gradually dividing into two groups. The first group includes Secretary State Baker, the most consistent supporter of active dialogue with the Soviet Union, and Sununu. The second, whose members are characterized by very deep doubts regarding the prospects for perestroyka and consequently the advisability of active and productive contacts with Moscow, includes Defense Secretary Cheney, his deputy, Paul Wolfowitz who, incidentally, heads the Pentagon's newly created Soviet Union and Eastern

Europe department, Deputy Secretary of State Eagleburger, who quite recently expressed a nostalgia for the cold war days because, in his own words, they were marked by stability and predictability, and last of all Robert Gates.

Standing apart from this group but close to it in spirit is Vice President Quayle. In a recent speech in Los Angeles the day after James Baker expressed support for perestroyka in a speech in New York, Quayle stated that "the Soviet Union remains our potential enemy." Brent Scowcroft also stands slightly apart: He is close to the Baker group but is ready at times to express solidarity with the Cheney-Gates group.

If evidence were needed that the Bush foreign policy team is not as monolithic as it seemed in the first few months of his administration, such evidence could be provided by the speeches of Baker and Quayle, which on many points contradict one another, and by the recent episode when the Secretary of State took the unprecedented step of "blocking" a speech that Gates was supposed to make—a speech which, according to the NEW YORK TIMES, contained a "gloomy prognosis" of the prospects for perestroyka in the Soviet Union. The Secretary of State explained his decision, which immediately became front-page news, by claiming that this was not a particularly appropriate time for speeches of that kind.

Gates had to back down, but it is very doubtful that he will change his position or his views. Especially since he is far from alone in the upper echelons of the administration. Meanwhile, Bush treats the growing contradictions in his immediate entourage quite calmly. This is the only way that I can assess his statement in an interview in November—and I am quoting the NEW YORK TIMES here—that "he likes the mix of pessimistic and optimistic views voiced by his administration's top officials toward the Soviet Union."

There is, so to speak, a reassuring factor: No U.S. administration yet has been free of acute conflicts within its foreign policy team. There is also a disturbing factor: While granting his advisers the right to disagree, Ronald Reagan did everything to ensure that in public the administration spoke with one voice. He did not often succeed, but he did try. Now the opposite is the case: A variety of views is encouraged, and they do not have to be in harmony at all. It seems to me that this could lead to an intensification of the discord in the Washington hierarchy and thus complicate the process of elaborating a Soviet policy.

One last point. Warships have been chosen as the venue for the meeting between the supreme leaders. Possibly they are more suitable for ensuring the security of the Soviet and U.S. Presidents. Although I doubt that it would be impossible to ensure security if the meeting were held on board passenger ships which, by the way, are far more comfortable. The most important thing is that as a symbol—if symbols are still necessary—a warship is no match for a civilian vessel when the meeting begins discussing how to make life on our planet more peaceful.

U.S. Reaction to East Europe Events 'Sober'

PM1411200789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Nov 89 First Edition p 7

[Gennadiy Vasilyev "Political Observer's Remarks": "Circumspection?"]

[Text] I think that it is already clear by now: 1989 will go down in history as the year of the greatest-ever changes in the socialist countries. Perestroyka in the Soviet Union, which is bringing back socialism's humane and democratic essence, the contradictory processes of political and economic changes in Poland and Hungary, and finally the fast development of events in the GDR—all these attract the attention of both professional politicians and millions of "ordinary people" all over the world.

Of course, the solution of accumulated problems and the imposition of order at home is up to the peoples of the socialist countries themselves. But considerable importance also attaches to the position that has been or will be adopted on these processes in other states, including in the West. Consideration and circumspection are probably needed now more than ever before. As far as one can judge by news agency reports, the changes in East Europe have caused a considerable stir among the mass media in the United States. The topic of the latest events in the East is permanently present and is debated in newspapers and television programs. Arguments about Washington's policy toward the socialist countries have flared up with renewed vigor. Some people criticize the Bush administration for its "overcautious" behavior and demand that the U.S. Government respond more positively to the Soviet Union's peace initiatives and help perestroyka. Others are frankly banking on growing difficulties in the socialist countries, adhering to the principle "The worse, the better." But what about the U.S. Administration itself?

Seeking an answer to this question, I cannot fail to draw attention to a statement made by Secretary of State James Baker on the ABC-TV "Nightline" program. The head of the foreign policy department advocated a gradual and peaceful development of events in East Europe. This is how he put it: "It seems to me that they will gradually move toward greater freedom... But this certainly does not mean total destabilization, chaos, bloodshed, and violence. What we would like most of all would be a gradual movement along the path of freedom in all East European countries, a movement toward the values to which we are committed. But we would like all this to happen peacefully. This is because instability accompanied by bloodshed and violence is not in the interests of a single East European country. Nor is it in the interests of the Soviet Union and the United States."

Let us leave aside the secretary of state's remarks about the peoples in socialist countries moving toward Western values. We believe that the revolutionary transformations in the countries in our region are aimed at restoring the genuine values of socialism. Let us focus attention on something else. Judging by the latest statements by a series of U.S. Administration leaders, the United States is in favor of peaceful development of the processes of renewal in the socialist countries and realizes that the maintenance of stability in Europe is in the interests of the peoples in the region and of the whole world. And if this is so, one could agree with President Bush who described Washington's response to events in East Europe as "sober."

Baker Warning on Bloc Instability Noted

PM1411155789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Interview with J. Baker"]

[Text] U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker has stressed the Administration's unchanging position in relation to the processes taking place in the USSR. In an interview with PBS [Public Broadcasting System] he stated: "We would like to undertake joint efforts in the spheres where we have mutual benefits, with the aim of creating a stable international situation. Such a situation will assist the success of perestroyka. We would like to hold joint consultations on questions such as attitudes to the market economy and other problems." All these questions, the secretary stated, will be discussed at the upcoming Soviet-American meeting in the Mediterranean.

"It is important for the United States to demonstrate that it is not trying to gain one-sided advantages as a result of the changes taking place in East European countries," J. Baker said. "We must stress that an unstable situation in East Europe or in the Soviet Union is not in Western interests. Such instability would not be in the U.S. interest." "We are not looking for one-sided advantages," the secretary of state repeated, "and we intend to behave accordingly."

Sees Changes

PM1511114789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "J. Baker on the Changes in Eastern Europe"]

[Text] Washington, 14 Nov—U.S. policy presupposes further promoting the increased openness in Eastern Europe and the openness and reforms in the Soviet Union, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker said. Speaking on an ABC Television program on Sunday, he said: "It is our policy not to seek a one-sided advantage and provoke instability. This is the policy we have conducted since the present administration took office and we firmly believe that it is the right policy."

J. Baker had already expressed the idea in the "MacNeil-Lehrer News Hour." It is important, he said, that we show we are not seeking, as President Bush noted, to obtain any one-sided advantages as a result of these events. It is important for us to firmly indicate that instability in Eastern Europe or instability in the USSR is not in the West's interests and is not in the interests of the United States."

The secretary of state called the process of democratization and economic reforms that is taking place in the USSR and the socialist countries of Eastern Europe "dramatic, important, and amazing." As for the Soviet Union, J. Baker noted, we are aiding this process by cooperating with the Russians in the establishment of a stable situation in the world. This means efforts to settle a number of regional conflicts. It also means progress in the sphere of arms control and cooperation with the Soviet Union in assisting this country, where possible, with technical and economic recommendations.

As for Eastern Europe, the secretary of state continued, we welcome the processes taking place there, but we are avoiding reacting too violently to them and we are avoiding actions that would imply a desire for one-sided advantages or would contribute in some way to instability.

Baker advocated joint efforts by the two countries to create a stable international situation. He named the problem of eliminating certain regional conflicts and arms control as the most important spheres of cooperation. The secretary of state acknowledged that the Soviet Union is abiding by its statements in the disarmament sphere by reducing conventional armaments. At the same time, he asserted that the USSR remains a superpower with a vast arsenal of armaments and from that viewpoint represents a threat to the United States.

We are still having problems with the Soviet Union in respect of its conduct in regional conflicts in various parts of the world, Baker claimed. We are making every effort to solve these problems. But I would hope that the progress we have made on the wide range of issues under discussion with the Soviet Union will definitely make the occurrence of a conflict between the superpowers less likely.

Northeast Asia

Yakovlev, Delegation Continue Visit to Japan

Delegation Members Listed

PM1411124589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Delegation Arrives in Japan"]

[Excerpt] A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation led by A.N. Yakovlev, USSR people's deputy, member of the Politburo, and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, arrived in Japan today on an official visit at the

invitation of this country's parliament. The delegation includes USSR People's Deputies V.I. Boldin, Yu.V. Golik, Yu.V. Gulyayev, V.Ya. Stadnik, O.O. Suleymenov, and V.A. Tikhonov. The Soviet parliamentarians will be having meetings with the leadership and deputies of the Japanese parliament, the prime minister, foreign minister, many eminent Japanese political and social figures, and representatives of business circles and the mass media.

The delegation was met at Haneda Airport by H. Okonogi, chairman of the Procedural Commission of the Japanese parliament's House of Representatives; S. Shimojio, chairman of the Procedural Commission of the House of Councillors; Y. Sakurauchi, chairman of the Parliamentary Japanese-Soviet Friendship Association; and other officials. Those present included N.N. Solovyev, Soviet ambassador to Japan. [passage omitted]

Correspondent on 13 Nov Activities

OW1411031389 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 13 Nov 89

[Text] A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, led by Yakovlev, member of the CPSU Central Committee's Politburo, is continuing its visit in Japan. The TASS correspondent in Tokyo has filed the following report:

The Soviet delegation held talks with Mr Hajime Tamura, speaker of the House of Representatives, and Mr Yoshihiko Tsuchiya, speaker of the House of Councillors, on 13 November. The meeting was also attended by Dietmen of the ruling and opposition parties.

Delegation leader Yakovlev described the progress of perestroyka in the Soviet Union and stated his views on the current international situation. He spoke as follows: We are now greeting a turning point. We are at an historic watershed. In other words, we are moving from war, armaments, conflicts, and sacrifices to a peaceful period in the life of humanity.

After making these remarks, the delegation head Yakovlev further touched on the problems related to the bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and Japan, and pointed out as follows: The dialogue at the top level to be held between our two nations should lead to a turning point in the relations between our two nations. The Soviet parliamentary delegation's visit to Japan should be taken as related to the preparations for the visit to Japan—scheduled in 1991—by Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and concurrently president of the Supreme Soviet. There is a trend recently for the bilateral relations to develop for the better, but it is still too early to say that they are steadily improving. The Soviet Union intends to expand bilateral relations at a faster pace, and we hope that it could be so. The Soviet Union and Japan are natural partners. We have every opportunity to fill the bilateral relations with a new content. This is what delegation leader Yakovlev has stated.

In response, Speaker Tamura of the House of Representatives and Speaker Tsuchiya of the House of Councillors pointed out that the progress of perestroyka in the Soviet Union had aroused great attention in Japan. They also pointed to the great importance of the policies based on new thinking to improve East-West relations, ease international tension, and ensure peace and stability in the world. Furthermore, the Japanese side said that the exchanges between the parliamentarians would be of great significance to deepening mutual understanding between the Soviet Union and Japan, and that the development of Soviet-Japanese relations would make a great contribution to ensuring peace and prosperity in the Asian-Pacific region. At the same time, the Japanese side again raised the so-called territorial issue.

Meanwhile, Soviet delegation head Yakovlev pointed out that it is necessary to remove all misunderstanding in a realistic way and as soon as possible. And then, he added: Only when our two nations can be active in a similar way, can we successfully conduct talks. Incidentally, it is known to all today that the Soviet Union is very active in its foreign policy. This is what delegation head Yakovlev has stated.

Entrusted by the USSR Supreme Soviet, delegation head Yakovlev invited a Japanese parliamentarians' delegation, as well as speakers of the both houses to visit the Soviet Union.

More on Yakovlev Talks With Emperor

LD1411234489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 14 Nov 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] The visit to Japan by a delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet headed by Comrade Yakovlev is continuing.

[Correspondent V. Tsvetov] Today Japanese Emperor Akihito received Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev. Comrade Yakovlev conveyed a verbal message to the emperor of Japan from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. During the audience the common opinion about the importance of deepening mutual understanding and the development of cooperation between the Soviet and the Japanese peoples was expressed. [video shows Yakovlev going to meet Akihito]

The words "the third path" are appearing in the news broadcasts of all the television networks, in the headlines of all the newspapers today. These words were spoken by Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev with regard to the development of Soviet-Japanese relations. The third path in interstate relations as a whole or the third path in the solution of territorial problems? There are many surmises and conjectures. However, Comrade Yakovlev said quite clearly and precisely: If the positions of the two countries differ, then the only means of getting relations out of a deadlock is dialogue. This is what the third path consists of. [passage omitted]

The day ended with a meeting between the delegation and deputies from the Association of the Japanese Parliament for Friendship with the Soviet Union. Comrade Yakovlev highly appraised the activity of the association which even in the years of the cold war did not give up its efforts to strengthen contacts with Soviet parliamentarians. Those attending the meeting discussed the new opportunities opening up for expanding ties between the parliaments of the two countries. [video shows Yakovlev at the meeting with parliamentarians]

Remarks on Meetings With Emperor, Kaifu

OW1411185289 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] The Emperor of Japan met with Yakovlev, a Politburo member of the CPSU Central Committee on 14 November. Politburo Member Yakovlev is visiting Japan as the head of a Supreme Soviet delegation.

Politburo member Yakovlev conveyed to the Emperor an oral message from Mr Gorbachev, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium. The message notes that Japan is an important neighbor of the Soviet Union and that both nations should make efforts toward the solution of international problems.

The Emperor expressed his thanks for the message. In the meeting between the Emperor and Yakovlev, both sides agreed on the importance of cooperation between the people of the two nations.

Politburo member Yakovlev, in an earlier meeting with Prime Minister Kaifu on 13 November, pointed out that the improvement of relations between the two countries is necessary not only for the benefit of their peoples, but also for the security of the Asia and Pacific region.

Yakovlev Urges Stable, Dynamic Ties

OW1411133889 Tokyo KYODO in English 1310 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] Tokyo, Nov. 14 KYODO—Soviet Communist Party Politburo Member Aleksandr Yakovlev Tuesday urged talks between Japan and the Soviet Union to resolve a territorial dispute involving four Soviet-held islands to the north of Japan.

Yakovlev, the most senior Soviet party official ever to visit Japan, made the call in a series of meetings with leaders of opposition and ruling parties.

The chief of a 23-member Soviet parliamentary delegation said stability and dynamism is needed in his country's relations with Japan.

Koshiro Ishida, chairman of the second-largest opposition party Komeito, and Eiichi Nagasue, chairman of the Democratic Socialist Party [DSP], urged Yakovlev to specify the nature of "a third way" to resolve the territorial dispute. Yakovlev referred to the need for a new plan in a meeting on Monday with ruling Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) Secretary General Ichiro Ozawa.

In recent months, Soviet academics have suggested two potential methods for resolving the territorial dispute.

They have said Moscow may return two of the four islands to Japan or that the two countries should put the four islands under their joint administration.

Yakovlev said professionals of working-level groups of the two countries have been working to draw up a peace treaty. When they reach a conclusion, there "may be a fourth or a sixth way," offered to resolve the dispute, he said.

The DSP's Nagasue demanded Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev to promise the return of the four Soviet-held islands when he visits Japan in 1991.

Yakovlev replied that when Gorbachev visits foreign countries, he comes without any precondition "and for the promotion of friendship."

But if the two sides make a constructive approach, Gorbachev's visit will be an "epoch-making," Yakovlev added.

The Soviets seized the four northern islands, the Habomai group, Shikotan, Etorofu and Kunashiri, shortly after the end of World War II.

Japan maintains it will conclude a peace treaty with the Soviet Union after the Soviets return the four islands.

Satsuki Eda, leader of the United Social Democratic Party, urged the Soviet Union to strive for protection of the environment.

Yakovlev said his country will engage in regional development in the Soviet Far East so as not to have an adverse effect on Japan.

In a meeting with former Foreign Minister and former LDP Secretary General Shintaro Abe, they agreed the two sides will adjust a schedule so the visit of an LDP delegation to be led by Abe will be materialized in early or mid-January, LDP officials said.

Stresses Importance of Ties

OW1411184589 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] Mr Yakovlev, a Politburo member of the CPSU Central Committee, said that the Soviet leadership views the USSR-Japan relationship as very inportant and hopes that this relationship will become one that is truly amicable and rich in substance. Politburo Member Yakovlev made this remark during his meeting with Prime Minister Kaifu. Mr Yakovlev is in Japan, heading a Supreme Soviet delegation.

On Prospects for Peace Treaty

LD1511124289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1136 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Tokyo, 15 Nov (TASS)—The Soviet leadership attaches special significance to USSR Supreme Soviet chairman Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Japan which is planned for 1991. This was said today at a news conference in the Japanese Journalists' Club in Tokyo by Aleksandr Yakovlev, people's deputy of the USSR, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Commission for International Policy. He is heading a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation which is in Japan on an official visit.

Yakovlev said: We proceed from the premise that the coming summit meeting will impart a new quality to Japanese-Soviet relations. We should like to hope that the Japanese side will also be guided by the same aspiration, for—as the Oriental saying goes—you need two hands to clap.

Yakovlev recalled that all of Gorbachev's past visits abroad had been very full, fruitful, and rich in content. Of course the visit to Japan, as to other countries, requires very careful preparation on both sides. I believe that both sides will prepare for it with a full degree of responsibility, he said. We are good neighbors, but we ought to be even better neighbors. We see this as one of the priority tasks of our foreign policy. We hope that the Japanese side thinks likewise.

Appraising the state of Soviet-Japanese relations, the head of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation stressed that equally important for the Soviet Union are good, open relations with all neighbors. We gave equal status to all directions of our foreign policy: European, Asian, Pacific, and American. A possitive accumulation has gradually taken place in Soviet-Japanese relations. Political dialogue has been activated. This is already a dialogue and not two independent monologues. In essence, this dialogue has become more substantive, oriented toward searching for a way out to new positions. Commercial, economic, scientific, and technological contacts are developing. Progress is noted in the cultural and humanitarian spheres.

We are in favor of the further development of all these trends and are striving toward ensuring that relations between the Soviet Union and Japan are built on the basis of true good neighborliness, are multifaceted and substantive, and that their level is appropriate to the place and role of both peoples in the world, Yakovlev said. It is necessary to patiently and consistently clear the path toward concluding a peace treaty on the basis of the further deepening of Soviet-Japanese relations, stepping up their volume and quality in all spheres.

Responding to question on the prospects of concluding a peace treaty, for which by way of conditions Tokyo is advancing the satisfaction of its territorial claims on the USSR, Yakovlev described as an anomaly the fact that a peace treaty has thus far not been concluded between two great states such as the Soviet Union and Japan. He pointed out that a bilateral working group on a peace treaty has been set up. The Soviet delegation head said: You do not agree with our position, and the Soviet side does not agree with the Japanese position. The establishment of a constructive dialogue in the working group on the peace treaty—this is the normal way.

We are in favor of this being a good neighborly and useful dialogue with Japan on all matters. This dialogue should help the broadest development of Soviet-Japanese relations in all spheres. Respecting both sides' positions and public opinion in both countries, we must proceed in this dialogue, overcoming one difficulty after another. Let us deepen and extend our relations. Then there will be more trust, more understanding, and more respect. And all the issues will appear more and more simple, Yakovlev said.

Speaks at Tokyo Reception

OW1411203589 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Announcer-read report by Tokyo correspondent Potapov on "excerpts" of a speech by Aleksandr Yakovlev, Politburo member, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and head of a CPSU Supreme Soviet delegation to Japan, at a reception for the delegation hosted by both houses of the Japanese Diet in Tokyo]

[Text] On 13 November, USSR Supreme Soviet delegation leader Yakovlev spoke at a reception hosted by members of both houses of the Japanese Diet in honor of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation.

Yakovlev said: The Soviet Union is resolutely calling for developing and strengthening positive trends in its relations with Japan. The official visit to Japan by USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Gorbachev, scheduled for 1991, gives substance to the sincerity and seriousness of such an approach. Against the backdrop of events and developments which were unthinkable only 3 or 4 years ago, the dialogue between the parliaments of the two countries is being revived under new conditions. Both hopes and distinct new possibilities can be felt. We are convinced that this is reform designed for better things, the freedom of man, a democratic social system, and the welfare of man.

Yakovlev said: At present, violence is beginning to be removed, although slowly, from the earth, our common home. But it is also true that the present age is complicated and faces many risks. The threat of nuclear arms, the destruction of the environment, a number of current systems, the symbols and banners of power and moral conditions—all these things also characterize the present age and they call for realism. What kind of realism? It is a highly significant realism that sees through the present trends and, in the course of doing so, finds a course for a more rational, more suitable, and more desirable life.

He added: Regarding such realism, General Secretary Gorbachev mentioned it in his speeches in Vladivostok in 1986 and in Krasnoyarsk in 1988. To some people at that time, General Secretary Gorbachev's proposals were somehow thought of as a fancy and a dream, but many of his proposals have become reality today.

He continued: Already there are no intermediate-range missiles in regions including the Soviet Far East region. The Soviet forces have been withdrawn from Afghanistan. Three-fourths of the Soviet forces stationed in Mongolia have been cut back. Sino-Soviet relations have been normalized and measures are being worked out for lowering the level of the military confrontation at the Sino-Soviet border. Relations with many Asian countries, including Indonesia, Vietnam, and the ASEAN member nations, have been normalized and developing. The process in the Cambodian situation is not easy, but there is progress.

Yakovlev said: Animation is clearly visible in Soviet-Japanese relations as well. The essential things are, of course, yet to come. Fortunately, both the Soviet Union and Japan, as well as all other countries in the Asian region, are destined to remain neighbors. If they hold their egoism in check only a little and look ahead into the future only a little, it will be possible for countries to become (?natural) partners.

He said: Sometimes unilateral arms reductions and the loss of certain concrete interests are called for from the Soviet Union. Are these things really possible in a world which is still armed, where there still are foreign bases where armed forces remain on the territory of other countries, where there are no effective methods of checking arms, and where there are no confidence-uilding measures yet? Of course, it is not that we begin everything with Soviet-Japanese relations. There have been times when things were more difficult and times when things have been better. Recently, political dialogues have become active. The political dialogues have become more concrete. The important thing is that they are turning in a new direction. Cultural exchanges are also becoming more active. Now it is time to develop trade and economic relations. It is particularly necessary to develop economic relations.

He said: This is because the demands of today's world can not be met with [word indistinct] and trade alone. We live in an increasingly interdependent world. Only when the welfare and security of the people of other countries are enhanced will it be possible for the people of many countries to make developments under the conditions of security and prosperity.

Yakovlev went on: The quarter of a century history of exchanges between parliamentarians of the Soviet Union and Japan reconfirms that parliamentarians began awakening to this truth long ago. What we must do now is to draw a practical conclusion from the experience through which we have deepened our mutual understanding. We are convinced that the people of our two countries will welcome such a change in Soviet-Japanese relations.

USSR Not To Send Troops Abroad

OW1511052689 Tokyo KYODO in English 0459 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Tokyo, Nov. 15 KYODO—Soviet Communist Party Politburo member Aleksandr Yakovlev has told Japanese Diet members that the Soviet Union will not resort to war in the future nor dispatch troops to other countries, government sources said Wednesday.

Yakovlev, widely regarded as the No. 2 man in the Kremlin after President Mikhail Gorbachev, made the remarks at a dinner hosted by the Japan-Soviet Parliamentarians' Association on Tuesday night, they said.

Yakovlev said the Soviet Union will try to reduce its stock of nuclear arms as well as conventional forces.

Yakovlev has been in Japan for a week-long visit since Sunday as head of a 23-member parliamentary delegation.

The speaker of the House of Representatives and the president of the House of Councillors invited the delegation to Japan.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Commentary Previews Namibian Elections

EA0811103389 Moscow International Service in Somali 1600 GMT 6 Nov 89

[Vladislav Chernukha commentary; from "World Events Today" feature]

[Text] Tomorrow, Tuesday, 7 November, elections will start under UN supervision in the Republic of South Africa's [RSA] colony of Namibia. These elections will continue for 5 days, and 72 MP's will be elected. This parliament will later draft the country's constitution, and will announce the independence day of Namibia. These general elections which will take place in Namibia are a basic part of the UN plan for the liberation of this country. Our commentator Vladislav Chernukha examines the issues:

The implementation of this plan, our commentator says, became possible after Angola, Cuba and the RSA reached an agreement through peaceful negotiations in December 1988. As expected, the preparations for these elections were not easy, and there were troops, police, and civilians from the United Nations. There is a campaign against democratic elections taking place against the South-West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], the most famous organization in that country. The supporters of this organization are very closely followed by people hired by other parties and the colonialist police. This has mostly been done by units of Koevoet, which were formed by the RSA to fight SWAPO and

terrorize all the broad masses of Namibia. The RSA has used all means to criticize SWAPO.

Our commentator says: I myself support those who view the recent statement by RSA Foreign Minister Roelof Botha as a condemnation of SWAPO. This minister announced last Wednesday that SWAPO is preparing for its units based in Angola to enter Namibia. But the UN representatives in Namibia demonstrated that this report quoted by the minister was a baseless lie. This anti-SWAPO campaign was undertaken to stop SWAPO from winning the forthcoming elections and gaining a two-thirds majority in the new Parliament.

There is no doubt that SWAPO will win a majority, because the popularity and reputation SWAPO enjoys with the broad masses of Namibia is very, very high. This is because the organization has been constantly struggling for the independence of Namibia for 30 years.

SWAPO's biggest rival is the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance, formed by the colonialist RSA, which is hoping that its creation will remain loyal to it. If SWAPO does not succeed in getting a two-thirds majority, it will be forced to form a coalition with this organization. But if it does succeed, it will naturally be possible for SWAPO to pass its program for drafting the constitution of the country.

Our commentator ends his remarks by saying that this will bring, and guarantee, the real independence of Namibia.

IZVESTIYA Views Situation in Ethiopia

PM0911160989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Nov 89 Moscow Evening Edition p 6

[Own correspondent G. Ustinov dispatch: "Cost of Division. The Situation in Ethiopia Has Drastically Deteriorated As a Result of the Rebel Troop Offensive"]

[Text] Addis Ababa—The life of foreign journalists in Addis Ababa has changed completely due to the war. You cannot go beyond the city limits. We cannot visit the administrative centers of Welo and Tigre Provinces now. They are in the hands of insurgents from the Tigre People's Liberation Front [TPLF]. The rebels are on the offensive, pressing the government army. As a staff worker, I stand by the map every day moving flags. The rebels have seized all Tigre Province, most of the provinces of North and South Gonder, and most of Welo and have reached the borders of Shewa Province where the country's capital—Addis Ababa—is located.

Although there is no fighting in the north of the country, in Eritrea the republic authorities only exercise power in three cities—Asmera, Keren, and the Red Sea port of Mitsiwa. The remainder of the province is controlled by the Eritrean People's Liberation Front [EPLF].

How did it all begin? Last March the EPLF inflicted a massive surprise strike on government troops. A strike which resulted in the surrender of virtually the entire province. The EPLF is an organization that advocates Eritrea's secession from Ethiopia and the proclamation of an independent state. The main stress here is on military force. But the EPLF also has proposals of a political nature: For instance, it proposes holding a referendum whereby the people themselves would decide what is best for Eritrea—complete secession or broad autonomy.

However, the EPLF believes that the referendum should only be conducted in Eritrea, in the hope that the question will be resolved unequivocally under present conditions. There is little logic in this. Today Eritrea is a part of Ethiopia, and if a referendum is held the whole country should take part in it. But it will hardly abandon this vitally important territory. For this would mean depriving itself of both seaports through which all its foreign trade has to pass.

The 28-year experience of the Eritrean war—the longest on the Dark Continent—has shown that there can be no military solution to this problem and that ways to a political settlement must be found. So on 5 June of this year the Shengo—the Ethiopian parliament—adopted a truly historic decision. All opposition parties, movements, and groupings were invited—without any preliminary conditions—to come to the negotiating table with the Ethiopian Government. The EPLF responded positively to this invitation 8 June followed by the TPLF—the second-biggest organization in terms of power and influence—on 11 June.

Difficult technical agreements and consultations ensued. Former U.S. President J. Carter took an active part in the incipient peace settlement process. Preliminary talks were held 7 through 19 September in his homeland in the city of Atlanta between representatives of the Ethiopian Government and the EPLF. They discussed 13 questions linked with the main negotiations—including the nature of their standing orders, the level and composition of delegations, and so on.

It proved possible to secure consensus on 10 points. The other three points concern cochairmen (J. Carter is to remain the chairman, as in Atlanta), international observers (the Ethiopian Government proposes that the USSR and the United States should adopt this role, while the EPLF would like to see such organizations as the United Nations, the OAU, and the Islamic Conference in this role), and the composition and functions of the secretariat for the "main" negotiations. The second phase of the preliminary meeting between the two sides is scheduled for 18 November in Nairobi.

The reader may feel perplexed: Why did the TPLF not take part in the discussion? The main reason for this, in my opinion, is the following: The protracted Eritrean conflict is in itself too complex to examine anything else with it. The negotiating process could have become deadlocked, but the government by no means intended to abandon talks with the TPLF representatives. However...

Whereas the EPLF, in response to the Shengo's appeal, ceased hostilities on the same day, 8 June, and is still abiding by this, the TPLF launched a powerful offensive on government troop positions at the end of August, on the eve of the talks in Atlanta, and throughout September and October seized a considerable proportion of the country's territory.

The republic's leaders regarded this development of events as a stab in the back. So a huge obstacle has arisen in the way of finding a peaceful settlement for Ethiopia's accumulated ethnic problems. The TPLF is establishing its own usages in the regions it has seized, along with its own "self-management organs," and is recruiting men and adolescents into its detachments, effectively fanning the civil war.

According to Ethiopian press data, the TPLF has existed since 1975. It has large, well-trained combat detachments. Whereas before TPLF detachments only had rifles, submachineguns, and light mortars, in the course of the September and October fighting they captured heavy artillery, tanks, armored personnel carriers, and rocket launchers from the government troops. They now have everything except aircraft.

How can you explain the fact that the government troops were unable to hold out in the face of this offensive? Here are a few reasons: The factor of surprise. The coordination of TPLF combat operations with armed detachments from other opposition groupings—the Amharic-speaking Ethiopian National Democratic Movement and certain others. This enabled the TPLF to move on from guerilla warfare to large-scale combat operations.

Lastly, officers and soldiers in the government troops are weary of the civil war that has dragged on so long in the country, and this also took its toll. This war is a grave burden on the republic's economy, and there are not enough funds to provide the Army with normal supplies of food and uniforms.

In his speech at an extraordinary Workers Party of Ethiopia [WPE] Central Committee Plenum on 30 October Ethiopian President Mengistu Haile Mariam, general secretary of the WPE Central Committee, urged the country's citizens to help the Army and inflict a decisive blow on the splittists. An emergency Shengo session 31 October adopted corresponding laws. People's militia detachments and detachments of party activists are now being set up in many areas, and additional financial and material resources are being sought. Troop subunits from "calm" provinces are being transferred to the line of confrontation.

Thus, we have war instead of a quest for peace. That is the price of division. Is it possible that the country's problems will be settled by political means now? What will be the future of the negotiating process that began with such difficulty? Will the proposed meeting between the government and the TPLF take place and will the talks between the government and the EPLF take place in Nairobi? These questions remain open.

Ethiopian Peace Prospects Assessed

PM0811152589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Nov 89 First Edition p3

[Report by S. Alerin: "Keys to Accord; Talks on National Reconciliation in Ethiopia Have Begun"]

[Text] Addis Ababa—A snaking line of buses stretching for hundreds of meters, their headlights on despite the blinding sun burning its way through the thin, muslin clouds, crawled slowly out of the labyrinth of small wattle-and-daub houses which are the "foundation" of the Ethiopian capital's architectural facade. Engines roaring with the strain and coughing out clouds of ash-black acrid smoke, the vehicles crawled along the road bed on bald tires and disappeared behind the nearby mountain ridge which "protects" Addis Ababa from the north. The only lingering memory was that of the curly-headed young men—many of them still boys—dressed in marsh-colored military service jackets and leaning out of the windows almost as far as their waists.

Their journey lay to the Tigre front. For several months now, the frontline has not only run through the lands of Tigre—an autonomous province in the republic where, 14 years ago, one of the movements in opposition to the government, a grouping of Tigrean nationals, proclaimed the slogans of struggling against the "dominant influence of the Amhara and Oromo," which are the main, largest nationalities of the more than 80 different nationalities living in the territory of modern-day Ethiopia. Striving to achieve its main aim—to secure "broad regional autonomy and democracy" for Tigre Province—as well as other aims and calling itself the Tigre People's Liberation Front (TPLF), this organization has mustered several tens of thousands of people under its banners and provided them with arms. An even greater number of Tigrean peasants have in fact become its potential allies, thereby adding to TPLF forces.

For a long time this force was not officially reckoned with, despite the fact that in spring 1988 government troops suffered a number of crushing defeats at the hands of the TPLF. The political front was recognized only at the beginning of this summer, when the Shengo, the republic's National Assembly, approved "the new peace initiative of the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia to settle the problems in the north of the country" and primarily the most serious of these problems, which has not given either the center or the whole of Ethiopia any peace for 29 years: the question of the Autonomous Province of Eritrea, situated on the Red Sea coast. Then Addis Ababa made a gesture to the TPLF. Its representatives were formally invited to "roundtable" talks which aimed to resolve urgent conflicts. However, this invitation has not been backed up by any real steps. Whereas contact was first established with the leaders of the Eritrean People's Liberation Front (EPLF), another grouping in opposition to the

central authorities and fighting for the secession of this autonomous province, and this contact was followed up by the first round of talks, albeit preliminary, in the U.S. city of Atlanta in September, the TPLF appears to have been "forgotten" once more.

But, at the end of August, the front made its presence felt again. In a demonstration of military muscle, well trained TPLF formations launched a broad offensive in the provinces of Welo and Gonder, neighbors of Tigre (which, incidentally, is completely in the hands of the rebels). (The name of another province as well, Gojam, has also been briefly referred to several times in Ethiopian periodicals). The rebels have broken through the government army's defensive formations, leaving yawning gaps. TPLF patrols and frontline detachments have begun to seep through them to the south. One of them recently sabotaged an electric power plant feeding energy to the capital's suburbs.

In these conditions, which spell crisis, on 18 October Haile Mengistu Mariam, the Ethiopian leader, addressed the nation on Ethiopian radio and television. Giving the general outline of the difficult situation that has taken shape in the country, he blamed the TPLF for taking divisive action to sow the poisonous seeds of interethnic discord and thereby objectively to strengthen the positions of those who want to tear Eritrea away from Ethiopia. The Ethiopian leader went on to stress that the country's popular masses are now faced with a choice: Either to agree to the secession of this northernmost province, and thereby cause the disintegration of the entire nation, or to channel "all available forces and resources into achieving a fundamental strategic victory."

True, at the same time the National Assembly made a demand to the TPLF that it leave the territory of Welo and Gonder without delay and agree to peace talks with the center.

The latter part of this appeal has been heard. First, contact was established between representatives of the Ethiopian Government and the TPLF in London, with Italy acting as intermediary, and then, at the end of last week, preliminary meetings were held between them in Rome. Judging by reports from the Italian capital, at Addis Ababa's insistence they were devoted to discussing procedural issues concerning the future talks, at which one would like to believe that the sides will try to smooth the sharp corners in their positions and eventually jointly seek ways to resolve the problem of Tigre and the north of the republic as a whole.

Of course, it goes without saying that it would be premature to conclude that the scales of a political settlement have begun to tilt in this issue. But it does seem, nevertheless, that things have started moving.

Shevardnadze Talks With Ethiopian Ambassador

PM1311165789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Ambassadors Received"]

[Excerpts] On 11 November E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, received A. S. Gonsalves, Indian ambassador to the USSR, at the latter's request. [Passage omitted]

On the same day, E.A. Shevardnadze received Asrat Wolde, Ethiopian ambassador to the USSR, who conveyed a personal message to M.S. Gorbachev from Mengistu Haile Mariam, general secretary of the Workers Party of Ethiopia Central Committee and president of Ethiopia. During the conversation the ambassador reported on the situation in Ethiopia, which has worsened recently as a result of increased activity by the armed opposition, and on the main results of the Workers Party of Ethiopia Central Committee plenum and Ethiopian National Assembly session which were convened in that connection.

After noting that the Soviet Union invariably advocates the preservation of Ethiopia's unity and territorial integrity, E.A. Shevardnadze confirmed support for the peace initiative to achieve a settlement of Ethiopia's internal conflict which was put forward by the Ethiopian Parliament in June 1989. Stress was laid on the importance of continuing the efforts to implement it by searching for political solutions and forms of national reconciliation.

'Joint Report' on Sao Tome Delegation Visit

PM0911103989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 3

["Joint Report on Visit to the USSR by the Delegation of the National Popular Assembly of Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe"]

[Text] A delegation of the National Popular Assembly of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe [DRSTP] headed by Francisco Fortunado Pires, member of the Movement for the Liberation of Sao Tome and Principe [MLSTP] Central Committee Politburo, member of the National Popular Assembly Standing Commission, and minister of justice and public affairs of the DRSTP, paid an official visit to the Soviet Union from 27 October through 3 November 1989 at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The Sao Tomean parliamentarians were received by R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities. Meetings and talks were held with members of committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet and of commissions of its chambers and at the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions.

Members of the Sao Tomean delegation laid wreaths at the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and the tomb of the unknown warrior by the Kremlin wall.

In addition to Moscow, the delegation visited the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic.

During the meetings and talks, which took place in a warm and friendly atmosphere, the Sao Tomean parliamentarians were briefed on the progress of perestroyka in the Soviet Union, the main areas of the political reform and the economic reform, and the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The guests spoke about the activity of the MLSTP, the National Popular Assembly, and the republic's government in resolving the socioeconomic problems facing the Sao Tomean people.

During an exchange of opinions on the international situation, the DRSTP MP's rated highly the Soviet Union's efforts aimed at ensuring further progress in the disarmament sphere, strengthening the atmosphere of trust and cooperation among peoples, and improving relations with all states.

The Soviet side noted with satisfaction the DRSTP's increasing role in African and world affairs, including questions of peace and international security, decolonization, and human rights.

The Soviet and Sao Tomean parliamentarians confirm their countries' adherence to the policy of a political settlement of regional conflicts, including on the African continent. They voice solidarity with the just struggle of South Africa's democratic forces for the dismantling of the apartheid system in the Republic of South Africa and declare their support for the "front-line" states' efforts aimed at turning the South African region into a zone of peace and stability. Both sides believe that the UN plan for Namibia must be implemented in full and within the times set and declare their support for the efforts of the People's Republic of Angola to ensure peace in the country on the basis of the accords reached at Gbadolite. They advocate a cease-fire in Angola as an important step toward a political settlement.

The Sao Tomean guests rated highly the Soviet Union's assistance for the DRSTP in various spheres during the period of developing its independence and the USSR's multifaceted support for liberation movements in Africa.

The participants in the talks voiced satisfaction with the friendly nature of Soviet-Sao Tomean ties and confirmed the intention of the top representative organs of both countries to promote their further development.

Both sides noted the usefulness and importance of the talks held and confirmed their mutual readiness to deepen fruitful ties between the two countries' parliaments.

The Sao Tomean parliamentary delegation expressed gratitude for the friendly welcome given it and invited a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation to visit the DRSTP. The invitation was gratefully accepted. The timing of the visit will be agreed on through diplomatic channels.

East Europe

Yakovlev Says Reunification Up to Germans

OW1511060189 Tokyo KYODO in English 0537 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Tokyo, Nov. 15 KYODO—Soviet Communist Party Politburo member Aleksandr Yakovlev said Wednesday that the Soviet Union will not interfere in the reunification of Germany.

Yakovlev, Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's right-hand man, said reunification of Germany is a matter that should be decided among Germans.

Yakovlev, in Japan since Sunday on a five-day visit as head of a 23-member parliamentary delegation, made the remarks at a meeting with Japan Socialist Party (JSP) Chairwoman Takako Doi, JSP officials said.

Yakovlev said he thinks the United States, Britain, and France do not want reunification of Germany and hope the Soviet Union would prevent such a development.

The situation in East Europe is a healthy process, he said.

Turning to Korea, Yakovlev said it is important that both North and South Korea have opportunities for positive dialogues. The Soviet Union is concerned about foreign forces stationed in South Korea, he added.

In this connection, the international atmosphere today is such that divided nations are heading for peaceful unification, Yakovlev said.

It would be good for North Korea if the Soviet Union improved ties with South Korea but North Korea has asked the Soviet Union not to do so, Yakovlev said.

Yakovlev said North Korea should complain less about Soviet efforts to improve relations with Seoul.

Portugalov Says Wall Has 'Lost Main Function'

AU1511110689 Hamburg BILD in German 15 Nov 89 p 2

[Interview with Nilokay Portugalov, Gorbachev adviser and Soviet expert on Germany, by Eberhard Laib: "Portugalov: Germans on Both Sides"; date and place not given]

[Text] BILD: What did you feel when you saw the first pictures of the open border?

Portugalov: It was very refreshing. I was moved. I consider the opening of the border an extraordinary positive aspect of current developments.

BILD: Do you see good reasons why the Wall should be dismantled?

Portugalov: It has lost its main function. I do not know why it should be kept in this form.

BILD: What do you think of reunification?

Portugalov: I do not believe in reunification. I proceed from the fact that socialism is not negotiable for most GDR citizens. As far as national legitimation is concerned: Of course, there is no GDR nationality. There are Germans on both sides.

BILD: Will the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] still play a role after free elections?

Portugalov: I hope that the opening of the border has strengthened the SED's authority.

Yeltsin Welcomes Opening of GDR Borders

AU1511115489 Hamburg BILD in German 15 Nov 89 p 3

[Interview with "Gorbachev critic" Boris Yeltsin by Eberhard Laib: "Yeltsin: They Are Finally Allowed To Travel"; date and place not given]

[Text] BILD: Perestroyka has reached the GDR. How do you assess current developments?

Yeltsin: The processes are only logical. If a general secretary resigns, the whole Politburo must resign as well. I think it is right for the citizens in the GDR to have an open border, which allows them to travel wherever they want. This means that the process of democratization is gaining strength in the socialist countries. This process was artificially slowed down in the past. Now things have finally started moving.

BILD: Does this mean that the process of democratization in the GDR has an impact on the acceleration of perestroyka in the Soviet Union?

Yeltsin: This is to be hoped.

BILD: You sound rather resigned. Is the process of perestroyka too slow for you? When will the process be completed?

Yeltsin: In the next century. The renewal of society will take three more generations. This process will not only affect us but other countries as well because morals are declining everywhere in the world—including the FRG.

Vremya Correspondent Interviews GDR's Modrow

LD1411220689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Interview with Hans Modrow, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers, by correspondent V. Mostovoy at People's Chamber in Berlin; date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast—Modrow and Mostovoy speak in German with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] [V. Mostovoy] [Word indistinct] the approved standing orders and routine for the day, the deputies of the GDR People's Chamber yesterday, for the first time in many years, conducted a frank dialogue on the country's economic situation and insistently demanded radical changes in the economy and in political life. In the deputies' speeches there was an awareness and feeling of their own guilt and responsibility for the fact that not until yesterday had they heard reports from the ministers of their own government and learned for the first time the sad statistics on the state of the national economy. It was no coincidence that the hall applauded vigorously in support of the proposal from a deputy suggesting that this session should be considered not the 11th session, but the first real assembly of people's deputies. [video shows scenes from People's Chamber session]

The election of the chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers was held late in the evening. Hans Modrow, member of the Politburo and first secretary of the SED [Socialist Unity Party of Germany] Dresden Bezirk [area] Executive, was elected to the post.

[Mostovoy, speaking to Modrow] In your opinion, what should be the new government's first steps?

[Modrow] The first, highly important steps must be to give the people reliable guarantees that socialism in the GDR will, as before, be our main task and goal. It is important that people be confident that we will constantly fight for peace and that, by strengthening friendship with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, we will reliably fulfill our obligations in the socialist community. As for domestic policy, the government's activity will be aimed primarily at conducting the economic reforms which everybody is awaiting.

[Mostovoy] How do you assess the prospects for the development of economic relations between our countries? What reserves do we still have here?

[Modrow] I would like to say that I intend to get in contact as quickly as possibly with Comrade Ryzhkov, the head of your government and my opposite number. The minister of foreign trade already has instructions to prepare for this, so that in the Soviet Union we can discuss all matters concerning not only our trade, but principally a significant deepening of coproduction and cooperation in the field of science and technology. I think that, in connection with the process of renewal in our country and perestroyka in your country, we can adopt a new approach to the problems of cooperation in foreign trade.

[Mostovoy] Thank you. I wish you great success in your activity. [video shows Mostovoy and Modrow talking together in parliamentary chamber after session]

GDR Central Democratic Block Meeting Reported

LD1411223289 Moscow TASS in English 2206 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] Berlin November 15 TASS—Representatives of the parties cooperating within the framework of the Central Democratic Block held a session in Berlin on Tuesday to prepare for the formation of a coalition government.

This was announced by the Press Department of the State Council of the German Democratic Republic.

Prime Minister Hans Modrow presented his concept of the new government. The concept will provide the framework for the formation of the government with the participation of all political parties.

General Secretary of the Socialist Unity Party Central Committee Egon Krenz, Chairman of the Democratic Farmers' Party Guenter Maleuda, Chairman of the Christian Democratic Union Lothar de Maiziere, Chairman of the Liberal Democratic Party Manfred Gerlach and Chairman of the National Democratic Party Guenter Hartman made relevant proposals.

The talks will be continued.

PRAVDA Updates GDR Situation

PM1411195589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Nov 89 First Edition p 6

[Own correspondent M. Podklyuchnikov dispatch: "Extraordinary Congress to Convene"]

[Text] Berlin, 14 Nov—The 11th Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee Plenum, held Monday [13 November] evening, decided to convene an extraordinary party congress, scheduled to be held 15-17 December this year.

Egon Krenz, general secretary of the SED Central Committee, spoke of the reasons why it is proposed to convene an extraordinary congress. He recalled that the 10th Central Committee plenum, held 3 days earlier, ended by adopting the party's action program and the decision to convene the 4th party conference. In this context, the speaker declared that, in making this decision, the Central Committee had fallen behind the dynamic and fast development of events within party ranks and had failed to respond to the demands and expectations of the broad party masses. The Politburo decision to immediately convene the 11th Central Committee Plenum was dictated by a desire to prevent any further lag and to maintain the party's unity. It is extremely necessary to convene the extraordinary party congress.

Hundreds of thousands of SED members found the suggestion to convene a party conference inadequate, and advocated convening an extraordinary party congress. Communists demand a radical renewal of the party making it possible to implement a program for socialism's renewal. Multitudes of resolutions, declarations, and letters have been received from SED party organizations and district and Bezirk committees justifying the need to hold an extraordinary congress and to elect a new Central Committee enjoying the full trust of the party masses and capable of shouldering responsibility for the implementation of the renewal program.

The decision made by the 11th SED Central Committee Plenum proposes the following agenda for the extraordinary congress: report by Egon Krenz, general secretary of the SED Central Committee, on the present-day situation and the party's tasks; report by the SED Central Auditing Commission; debate; election of SED Central Committee and Central Auditing Commission; and adoption of decisions, including decisions on the elaboration of the party's new program and new statutes. The plenum decision points out that the number of candidates nominated for election as congress delegates at all levels may be greater than the number of actual delegates.

Elections of a new chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers took place at a sitting of the GDR People's Chamber, which was also held yesterday evening. Hans Modrow, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo, was nominated as candidate. Only one vote was cast against him. The People's Chamber instructed the newly elected head of the Council of Ministers to submit a proposal on the composition of the republic's government. The next sitting of the People's Chamber is scheduled for 17-18 November. The chairman of the Council of Ministers will deliver a government statement at this sitting, outlining its action program.

Following the People's Chamber sitting, Hans Modrow replied to journalists' questions. He said that the government will be formed on a coalition basis. Its first steps will be to implement a social policy in line with the people's interests and wishes. Economic reform will be implemented stage by stage. The most competent specialists will be involved in its elaboration. Numerous suggestions have already been received from many experts, combine general directors, and scientists.

The election of the chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers was preceded by the election of president of the People's Chamber. Five candidates were nominated. There were two rounds of voting. The result was that Guenther Maleu[illegible], president of the Democratic Peasants' Party of Germany, was elected president of the People's Chamber by a majority of votes. A People's Chamber Presidium was also elected.

Following what has become a custom over the last few weeks, a demonstration was again held in Leipzig Monday, this time attended by up to 200,000 people.

The majority of participants advocated the renewal of socialism and of the country's entire life. They demanded free elections and the resignation and punishment of the party and state officials who are to blame for the prevailing crisis. At the same time, the slogans beneath which the demonstration was held also included some which smeared the GDR, others which were aimed against the SED, and yet others containing demands to eliminate the state security organs.

The GDR public's attention is focused, as before, on the government decision allowing the country's citizens to travel abroad without any obstructions. People's Police organs have already issued over 5 million visas for private travel. In view of the new atmosphere created thanks to this decision, many GDR citizens who had earlier rashly gone to the West are now expressing a desire to return home. According to West German Red Cross estimates, their numbers have already reached approximately 10,000. In this connection the GDR Red Cross is setting up four camps near the border with the FRG where returnees will be able to find shelter while their documents are being sorted out and questions of work and housing are solved.

Gerasimov on Impact of GDR Developments

PM1411165889 London BBC Television Network in English 2130 GMT 13 Nov 89

[From the "Panorama" program, interview with Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov, who is in Paris, by host David Dimbleby in London—live]

[Excerpts] [Dimbleby] Mr Gerasimov, if I could begin with you, events are obviously moving very fast, but I'd like to go to a kind of gut question: If East Germany keeps to its promise and free elections are held and a newly elected East German Government decides to withdraw from the Warsaw Pact, is there anything the Soviet Union could or would do to try and prevent that?

[Gerasimov] This is a hypothetical question—so if: It's a big "if." But in general terms I can answer that governments change, governments come and go, but international commitments remain, so if a new Germany wants to negotiate something it will go on negotiating it, but it's just not automatic. We have a mechanism of Warsaw Pact, and we have our commitments to this Pact—it's that simple.

[Dimbleby] So what happens if a freely elected government in East Germany says it wants to unite with West Germany, and it has this Pact, as you say, with the Soviet Union?

[Gerasimov] We have a change of government in Poland; we have a change in Hungary—and they're members of Warsaw Pact. So we must wait until the developments. I don't want to go further into this hypothetical situation. Also, I want to say that we must look at this in all European context, in the context of a confrontation between two blocs—NATO on one hand and Warsaw Pact on the other. And of course this eventuality is going to change the stability, so we must look at it again if and when it happens—not now. Now it's too early....

[Dimbleby interrupts] But is the Soviet Union...

[Gerasimov] to talk about it.

[Dimbleby] ...is the Soviet Union made nervous by all the talk now of a reunited Germany?

[Gerasimov] Well, who wants united Germany, actually? So, we are not afraid. We are watching the events in German Democratic Republic, and I think that they must be welcomed because they defuse the confrontation in Europe, so they help to build all European home which we are talking about. So I'm welcoming these changes. As to the united Germany, it's not a question which must be dealt with in all European context and in the context of existing... now existing military confrontation. [Passage omitted]

[Dimbleby] Mr Gerasimov, can I ask you a question, which I think a lot of people in the back of their minds in Britain are worried by, which is the actual standing of President Gorbachev after having allowed this to happen—indeed, encouraged it to happen in Eastern Europe: self-determination—and having at the same time to persuade Estonians and Lithuanians and Latvians that what's all right for East Germans isn't all right for them. And there is concern in Britain that this may be a dangerous course for Mr Gorbachev and his reforming policy.

[Gerasimov] That's quite a different story: It's a domestic issue for us. And we have our parliaments in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and they have discussions, and we have our constitution, so why... this constitution... if one or two republics want to get out, they can get out, but it is not for us—not for Moscow—to encourage this kind of separatism. You are not encouraging separatism in your own United Kingdom.

[Dimbleby] But is there not a danger that the pressure will be on Mr Gorbachev —perhaps from the military in the Soviet Union—to reverse some of these decisions that have been made over Eastern Europe: that he may be... they may be quite alarmed at the prospect of a galloping move in East Germany towards unity with West Germany?

[Gerasimov] No, these changes go the same way as our perestroyka goes: So why should we try to hold the tides? Not at all.

[Dimbleby] Except you say the Warsaw Pact matters, and that is the bottom line of your policy: that that mustn't be broken.

[Gerasimov] But I also said that it's just my contradiction with Mr Kissinger... I also said that Warsaw Pact and NATO must be disbanded simultaneously. He wants to retain NATO and maybe Warsaw Pact. We want to get

rid of these two Pacts, to get rid of this military confrontation in Europe now. With all the embraces we see on television screens between Germans, who believes in the threat from the East or in threat from the West? So it's time really to get together.

[Dimbleby] Are the Russians happy to see Germans embracing on the Berlin Wall after the 20 million Russians who were killed in World War II?

[Gerasimov] We are happy in the sense that it defuses the military confrontation in Europe. In this sense, yes.

Government Congratulates GDR's New Premier

PM1511112089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

[USSR Council of Ministers message: "To Comrade Hans Modrow, Chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] Please accept cordial congratulations on yc · election as chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers.

We are confident that the relations that have become established between our countries will undergo further development and will reliably serve the renewal of socialism, the strengthening of fraternal friendship, and the deepening of all-around cooperation between the peoples of the USSR and the GDR.

The USSR Council of Ministers.

Bulgaria Seen Aiming for Real Perestroyka

PM1411193589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Nov 89 First Edition p 6

[Own correspondent L. Zhmyrev dispatch: "Changes in Bulgaria"]

[Text] Sofia, 14 Nov—Like a river which has been dammed for a long time, Bulgarian society, opening the floodgates of glasnost and democracy, is beginning to gather pace along the path of transformations.

A plenum held Friday 10 November elected Petur Mladenov general secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP] Central Committee, and a Politburo session on Monday [13 November] decided to convene another Central Committee plenum in the next few days to examine "several current and organizational questions."

At the same time, according to newspaper reports, it was decided to convene a regular session of the Bulgarian People's Republic National Assembly at the end of the week. It is due to examine the question of the chairman of the Bulgarian People's Republic State Council in view of the fact that T. Zhivkov has asked to be relieved of this post as well.

Bulgaria greeted with satisfaction the news of a telephone conversation between P. Mladenov and M.S. Gorbachev during which it was emphasized that the two leaders will continue to work to expand ties between the BCP and the CPSU and between the Bulgarian People's Republic and the USSR and to strengthen Bulgarian-Soviet friendship, and that they will collaborate in implementing revolutionary perestroyka in both countries in the interests of our countries' fraternal peoples. This contact precedes P. Mladenov's trip to Moscow, planned for the near future, and his personal meeting with the Soviet leader, who, in a greetings telegram sent immediately after P. Mladenov's election as general secretary, expressed the Soviet people's belief that the Bulgarian Communists and all working people in the country will prove equal to the tasks facing them with regard to radically and consistently renewing society in the spirit of the socialist choice.

The BCP's renewed leadership prefers to act without shillyshallying. Proof of this can be seen in the decision made at the Monday Politburo session to restore the unbroken party membership of a group of well-known Bulgarian intellectuals who were subjected to gross administrative pressure and persecution in the recent past and to reinstate them in their jobs.

This decision evoked a broad positive response in society. I asked Dimitur Stanishev, secretary of the BCP Central Committee, for his comments.

The decision to "rehabilitate" the group of Communist intellectuals, D. Stanishev said, testifies that the BCP intends, not in words but in deeds, to effect a genuine turnabout along the path of expansion of glasnost and the democratization of society, respect for the individual, pluralism of opinions, and restoration of justice. We hope that this line will be further pursued at the forthcoming BCP Central Committee plenum and at the session of the Bulgarian People's Republic National Assembly this week.

Let me also add that widely known public figures in the country like writer Georgi Mishev, philosopher Ivan Dzhadzhev, Nedyalko Belev, Nikolay Vasilev, journalists Georgi Tambuev, Sonya Bakish, and Koprinka Chervenkova, and others listed in the Politburo decision were falsely accused on trumped-up pretexts, deprived of their party membership cards, and forced to resign or change their jobs.

Let me cite the example of my fellow journalist G. Tambuev, former member of the RABOTNICHESKO DELO Editorial Collegium, whom I know very well personally. A talented current affairs writer who raised burning topics of social justice, he was accused in March of last year of slander, misleading information, and even libel for a series of critical articles under the general heading "Corruption in Power."

Similar charges of "absolutizing negative phenomena," "distorting the real picture of life," and "creating an atmosphere of skepticism and pessimism" were filed against other Communist intellectuals who are now being restored to the BCP and their former jobs.

Attention is drawn by the changing tone of the material carried by newspapers and especially the readers' letters. Welcoming the recent party Central Committee plenum decisions, writers of letters to the editorial office look into the future soberly and without euphoria, realizing that "leaders depart, but the problems remain with us." At the same time, they "encourage" the press to be more resolute in overcoming its former timidity and stereotypes.

A letter published in today's issue of RABOTNICHESKO DELO is indicative in this respect. Letter-writer I. Dimitrov, a resident of Sofia's "Iztok" District, writes without beating about the bush: "I am writing to reproach the newspaper: Why don't you offer us materials which reflect the people's genuine feelings following this historic plenum? You must know that, on hearing P. Mladenov's speech, people sincerely congratulated each other in the streets and squares. The people are most unambiguously displaying their attitude toward the plenum's decisions, and yet you are failing to reflect this spontaneous joy and optimism."

The letter writer from Sofia goes on to express many readers' hope that RABOTNICHESKO DELO will prove capable of helping the new leadership at a difficult time, when it is raising the flag of genuine rather than sham perestroyka in Bulgaria.

Reportage on Helmut Kohl's Visit to Poland

Discussion With Jaruzelski

PM1511114989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Nov 89 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Readiness for Cooperation"]

[Text] Warsaw, 13 Nov—Problems of the normalization and development of bilateral relations between the Polish People's Republic and the FRG on the basis of the 1970 Treaty and questions of European cooperation were discussed during a meeting between President W. Jaruzelski of Poland and FRG Chancellor H. Kohl, who is in Poland on an official visit.

The significance of positive political, moral, and material factors which ensure mutual trust and respect was emphasized at the meeting. They are an indispensible precondition for overcoming existing divisions and achieving genuine reconciliation and an important factor in building the common European home. The inviolability of the borders and respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of all the European states which ensue from the spirit and the letter of the CSCE Final Act represent the basic precondition of peace and harmonious development for all-European cooperation.

The will was expressed to accelerate the development of bilateral cooperation in many spheres, and especially the economic sphere.

Signs Joint Statement With Mazowiecki

LD1411204589 Moscow TASS in English 2033 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] Warsaw November 14 TASS—Polish Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki and West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl signed today a joint statement.

Poland and West Germany, the statement says, are aware of their responsibility for the policy of peace, accord and cooperation in the interests of people and nations of Europe.

The fiftieth anniversary of the Second World War, that began with Hitlerite Germany's assault on Poland, and the immense losses that war brought about, are a warning and a call for forming durable peaceful relations between the two states and nations.

Recalling the tragic pages of history, Poland and West Germany are fully determined to build their relations oriented towards the future and setting an example of good neighbourliness. The sides, the statement says, consider it their aim to secure peace and cooperation in Europe. They favour the inviolability of borders and respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of all states on the continent.

In the foreign and domestic policies of the two countries, priority will be given to the norms of international law, including the ban on the use of force, respect for human rights and the right of nations to self-determination, principles of peaceful settlement of disputes, equality and non-intervention in the internal affairs of the states.

The sides regard the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference for Cooperation and Security in Europe and the final documents of the Madrid and Vienna meetings as the basis of their relations and will implement them in all areas.

Poland and West Germany confirm that their political aim is an effective prevention of any war, nuclear or conventional. They resolutely favour the attainment of concrete results in arms control and disarmament.

The sides agreed that negotiations on conventional arms in Europe must result in a stable and secure balance at the lowest possible level, sufficient for defence but precluding the potential for a surprise attack and large-scale offensive operations. The sides will make efforts to promote the signing, already in 1990, of the first treaty in the field of conventional weapons.

Poland and West Germany reiterated their support for talks between the United States and the Soviet Union on a fifty per cent cut in strategic nuclear weapons.

On Unification, Europe's Future

PM1511124989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "H. Kohl's Visit to Poland Continues"]

[Text] Warsaw, 14 Nov—FRG Federal Chancellor H. Kohl, who is on an official visit to Poland, has visited the Polish parliament, where he paid calls on Marshal of the Sejm M. Kozakiewicz and Marshal of the Senate A. Stelmachowski.

The chancellor had a meeting with approximately 60 Sejm deputies and senators representing all the parliamentary clubs and the two chambers' main commissions. Now that a new chapter of history is beginning, especially for young people, he said addressing the gathering, we all need a common European home; new life must be breathed into the old continent. If we want to build the future together our countries need one another. Many difficult problems lie ahead, but this process must be started, H. Kohl said, noting the great importance of the reforms that are being carried out in Poland and Hungary, and now in the GDR as well.

Answering a question about the prospects for German unification, the FRG chancellor said that the right to self-determination, contained in the U.S. Charter and human and civil rights pacts, is the right of all the peoples. He expressed the belief that Germans will have this opportunity some time in the future. But it will be realized in such a way that it will be possible to live in concord with neighboring states, H. Kohl noted. It is necessary also to appreciate that the 21st century will be the century not of national states, but of Europe.

At the "Marriott" hotel in Warsaw H. Kohl arranged a reception in honor of Polish Council of Ministers Chairman T. Mazowiecki. The most important thing now is to make peace a reality, he said at the reception. It is an important time in international politics, when obsolete structures are collapsing and when the gaps are disappearing. Europe is going through a crucial period and, despite its long history, it is becoming a young continent. Therefore everyone must move together toward a greater Europe, our common Europe, in which everyone will have a place, the chancellor noted.

In his reply speech T. Mazowiecki stressed that H. Kohl's visit will contribute to better mutual understanding, which is so important for the future. Poles attach special significance to having confidence in the durability of the final settlements connected with the 1970 treaty and to the further progress of the cause of mutual understanding. He stressed Poland's resolve to continue the process of democratic reforms and reforming of the economy. Indeed, Europe needs a stable Poland.

West Europe

French Foreign Minister Dumas Winds Up Visit

Talks to Shevardnadze on Mideast Peace

LD1411183489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1715 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 14 Nov (TASS)—During an exchange of views on the Middle East situation, Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, and Roland Dumas, French minister of state and minister of foreign affairs, declared themselves in favor of a rapid political settlement of the Arab-Israel conflict, which would be in full accord with the vital interests of the peoples and states in the region, as well as with the interests of consolidating international peace and security.

The USSR and France intend to step up their actions aimed at encouraging the efforts that are being made to establish a political dialogue between the sides directly involved, with due regard for their rights and interests, for the purpose of weakening the confrontation and creating an atmosphere of trust.

The sides confirmed their readiness to initiate consultations of the permanent members of the UN Security Council in order to study ways of launching the peace process in the Middle East.

The Soviet Union and France hold to the view that an international conference on the Middle East, with the participation of representatives of all interested parties and the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, would lead to a comprehensive settlement guaranteeing peace and security for all the states of the region, including Israel, on the basis of the principle of the impermissibility of acquiring territory with the help of force, and of the implementation of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination.

In an examination of the situation in The Lebanon, the ministers noted the need to implement the Al-Ta'if agreements, the first stage of which was the election of the new president of the Republic of Lebanon. The Soviet Union and France call upon all parties to make their contribution to this process of national reconciliation and restoration of the unity, independence, and sovereignty of Lebanon on all its territory.

In the spirit of the joint statement by Mikhail Gorbachev and Francois Miterrand of 5 July 1989, both sides confirm their common intention to promote a political settlement of the situation in Lebanon.

Meeting With Shevardnadze, Lunch

PM1511111889 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Nov 89 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report on Shevardnadze's 14 November talks with French Foreign Minister Dumas and the luncheon in his honor, under the heading "Multifaceted Soviet-French Political Dialogue"]

[Text] Moscow, 14 Nov (TASS)—Talks were held today at the USSR Foreign Ministry between E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, and R. Dumas, minister of state for foreign affairs of France, who was in Moscow on an official visit.

The talks have become an essential link in the unbroken dialogue which has been established between the two countries in the recent period. Characteristic of the

contacts that have taken place were the breadth of the joint survey of international events, maximum frankness of judgements and assessments, and a thrust toward achieving specific concensus on the matters under discussion.

The ministers noted with satifaction that the general evolution and current state of affairs in Europe make it possible to speak of progress toward a new quality of mutual relations between states of the continent. Priority tasks in this area are implementation in full of the Vienna accords and the development of all-around cooperation common to all of Europe. The sides came to the joint view that a strategy for common European movement in the forthcoming period could be elaborated at a new summit meeting of the 35 member states of the CSCE.

R. Dumas, foreign minister of the country which is chairing the European communities, and E.A. Shevardnadze discussed the prospects of further developing relations between the Soviet Union and "The Twelve", and the possibilities of providing them with new organizational forms.

A detailed exchange of views took place on the progress of the talks on reducing the armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe, and the elaboration of an all-embracing convention on the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons. The mutual intention was expressed to activate Soviet-French interaction for the speedy attainment of concrete results in these spheres.

Particular attention at the talks was devoted to an analysis of the situation in Eastern Europe and the profound social and sociopolitical shifts taking place there. As was stressed by the Soviet side, we are counting on understanding by the West for the situation which has arisen, and on actions in a constructive key. The thrust of French policy toward the development of all-around cooperation with East European countries, in the context of the construction of an all-European home, is valued in Moscow.

Great concern is aroused by the attempts being made by some circles in the FRG to place the issue of the reunification of Germany on the plane of present-day policy. In the case in point, E.A. Shevardnadze stressed, we are dealing with a phenomenon which affects the vitally important interests of many European countries. What is at hand is a desire to contest the existence of a sovereign state, the German Democratic Republic, and indeed the territorial and political make-up of the continent as a whole.

The ministers spoke in favor of creating in Europe an atmosphere which will favor the constructive resolution of the existing problems, help to consolidate security and stability on the continent, and prevent the unpredictable development of events.

The main ways to attain these goals are a consistent deepening of the all-European process, a progressive rapprochement between the eastern and the western parts of Europe, the overcoming of the confrontational nature of relations between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, and the development of economic, humanitarian, and cultural ties among Europeans.

As far as regional problems are concerned, the situation in the Near East, in particular in Lebanon, and also around Afghanistan, in Cambodia, and in Central America was examined. The ministers adopted a special joint statement on the Near East.

On the instructions of the leaders of both countries, the ministers examined the course of implementation of 22 Soviet-French agreements, signed during M.S. Gorbachev's official visit to France in July this year. Satisfaction was expressed on both sides with the successful development of cultural exchanges and human contacts between both countries. At the same time there have, as yet, been no substantial positive changes in economic cooperation. Vigorous efforts will be undertaken on both sides to rectify the situation that has come about.

An accord has been reached on the opening of general consulates of the USSR and France in Strasbourg and Kiev respectively.

The ministers heard and approved the accounts of those in charge of bilateral working groups which have been set up for the duration of the visit to study the possibilities of stepping up further Soviet-French cooperation in European affairs, in disarmament questions, in resolving regional problems, in tackling international economic problems, and in the sphere of bilateral relations.

On the same day, E.A. Shevardnadze hosted a luncheon in R. Dumas' honor. Present at the luncheon were heads of a number of ministries and departments, scientific establishments and other officials and, on the French side, officials accompanying R. Dumas.

Addressing his guest, E.A. Shevardnadze said, that the current Soviet-French talks have a dual role. On the instruction of the leaders of the two countries, we have considered some specific matters of bilteral Soviet-French relations from the point of view of the fulfillment of the 'record package' of agreements concluded during the visit by M.S. Gorbachev to France which took place in July this year.

The main thing, the minister stressed, is to arrive more quickly at specific results helping the activation of direct Soviet-French contacts, and expanding the cooperation which has brought a real effect in the economic, technological, cultural, and humanitarian spheres.

No less important is another aspect of today's talks. We exchanged appraisals and specified possibilities for the further interaction of the USSR and France in connection with those processes and events which are taking place at the present time in the world. We naturally devoted special attention to European development.

Its current stage is distinguished by a resolute switch from distrust and alienation, from the reflexes of solving problems by coercive methods, toward constant dialogue, the shaping of a legal basis for just interstate relations, and the development of a genuine international economy.

E.A. Shevardnadze said that he would like to welcome R. Dumas also in his capacity as chairman of the Council of Ministers of the European Community. We are in favor of the development of dialogue between the USSR and the EC, and the meeting between the ministers of foreign affairs of the Soviet Union and the 'Twelve' in September this year again showed this.

We are also counting on the speediest conclusion of an agreement on trade and cooperation between the USSR and the EC.

It seems important to us that in Paris they were among the first to see the horizons for wider common European integration which are opening up with the realization of the idea of a common European home.

The establishment of trust, cooperation, and security in Europe is unthinkable without a lowering of the level of military confrontation and a reduction in armed forces and conventional weapons.

Our two countries advocate the vigorous conduct of the Vienna talks and the speediest achievement of specific results there.

As today's talks have shown, both Moscow and Paris regard as constructive the proposal that an agreement on this score be signed by the end of next year at the conference of heads of state and government of the European countries, the United States, and Canada.

The minister went on to note that in recent days events in the GDR have been attracting universal attention. The new leadership of the GDR is taking radical steps which, undoubtedly, will be continued. It has a clear plan of action. This is borne out by the changes that have already occurred. Our common duty is to support this new line and the leaders who are taking it.

In this country, as in other countries of Eastern and Central Europe, processes are under way for the radical renewal of socialism, the search for new paths of progress. We know from our own experience that in periods of deep reforms there arise considerable complexities and difficulties. And in the recent past many West European countries also came up against this.

The implementation of reforms, their speed, character, and depth—all of this is an integral part of the freedom of choice of every state, every people.

We do not consider it possible to interfere in any way in these entirely internal affairs of sovereign states. But all the others should act in the same way and not allow attempts to make capital from complications that emerge or to foist all manner of "advice" or conditions on them.

It is even more inappropriate at this difficult point in time to make statements which can look like an encouragement of extremist tendencies. After all, the issue revolves around the problem of Europe's territoral structure. And this represents the most sensitive quintessence of security on the continent, not just as far as the Soviet Union and France are concerned, but also as far as many other countries are concerned.

A cautious and responsible approach and a realistic appraisal of the situation are always essential and at present this is particularly the case. Europe has no right to forget the lessons of its own history. The top leaders of our two countries keep in touch with regard to these problems.

As today's talks have shown, the Soviet Union and France continue to be at one in their approach to the tasks of strengthening stability, or adhering to the territorial structure and inviolability of frontiers in Europe.

We can note with satisfaction that the ever-deeper mutual understanding and joint actions of our two countries facilitate the strengthening of constructive tendencies in international life.

There is no doubt that our present talks and your conversation with M.S. Gorbachev will become a very timely and important step along this path.

In a reply speech, R. Dumas said that we are living in an historical time. Having with full consciousness taken upon ourselves the responsibility, we must strive toward turning this exceptional period into a major opportunity for our continent.

Your country has shown the example of movements in this direction. It has become an enormous construction site for reforms. Your perestroyka is making great strides, the evidence of which is the work of the congress of People's Deputies and the new USSR Supreme Soviet. We familiarized ourselves with the greatest attention, Mr Minister, with the text of the report which you delivered in the Soviet parliament on 23 October and which was devoted to an exposition of the conception of your country's international activity.

The considerable changes which are taking place in it do not remain without consequence for the other European countries, too. Calls for the extension of freedom and democracy were heard yesterday in Budapest and Warsaw, and today in Berlin. Thus we are presented with an historic opportunity to overcome divisions, to give people the opportunity to decide their destiny for themselves, and to restore the unity of Europe. We express the wish that all Europe should take part in this process in order to attain European reconciliation in the last years of our millenium.

Any transformation involves risk. When history awakens, there arises a need for guarantees and security. At the same time there arises a new risk of instability.

You are familiar with our approach to the future of Europe. We are striving to stregthen the consolidation of the European community. France and the Federal Republic of Germany have together resolutely embarked on the path of European unity. This should be perceived by everybody as a factor of stability on our continent.

On the other hand, we do not want old differences to remain and new ones to emerge. Consequently, it is necessary to strengthen cooperation in all areas among European from East and West Europe and from North and South Europe.

It is in this dual context that the so-called "German question" should be tackled. We are of the view that each people has a right freely to determine its own destiny: this applies to the German people just as much as to all other peoples.

However, the destiny of one people should not be perceived by others as a danger, threat, or risk. In time, and given official guarantees, reconciliation should be taking place everywhere in Europe, while a free choice by one of the peoples will not be perceived by anyone as a threat to their own security or stability.

The rights to have hopes and security, combined with each other, should lay the foundation of Europe's new unity.

The CSCE process has made it possible to move forward along this path. Our joint actions should make it possible to proceed faster and further both in the area of security and disarmament and in the field of economic cooperation and human rights. You are aware of the significance we attach to the development of this dialogue.

We carried out an in-depth exchange of views on all the major world issues. I would like, with great satisfaction, to recall the tangible examples of our cooperation in the Near East and Asia which have become possible thanks to our close ties which have been established over the past few months. We decided to expand this cooperation. With these aims in mind a new working group in charge of the questions of international cooperation and North-South relations has been set up. Other opportunities at our disposal should also be utilized. One gets nowhere by standing still.

F. Mitterand's last meeting with M.S. Gorbachev in Paris laid the foundation for renewing bilateral cooperation. It is precisely in this spirit that we should reflect on how to make our bilateral efforts in the areas defined in the numerous agreements, concluded in Paris in July this year.

The talks and the luncheon passed off in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

On the same day the French minister of state for foreign affairs laid a wreath at the tomb of the Unknown Soldier by the Kremlin Wall.

In the evening R. Dumas left for home.

He was seen off at the airport by E.A. Shevardnadze and other officials.

Meeting With Gorbachev

PM1511111489 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Nov 89 Second Edition pp 1-2

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev's Meeting With R. Dumas" on the 14 November meeting between Gorbachev and the French foreign minister]

[Text] On 14 November M.S. Gorbachev received French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas. Soviet-French cooperation was highly appraised in the context of the current important stage of European and world development.

A summit dialogue between the USSR and France has become a permanent and irreplaceable factor of an international scope.

A high degree of accord reached during the meeting between Gorbachev and Mitterrand in Paris last summer was confirmed on key current questions.

Gorbachev shared his thoughts on the main trends in East-West relations in the European process, in the socialist world.

"We have been at a crossroads quite recently," he said. "What road the world will take: to the further confrontation, aggravation of ideological struggle, heightening of the danger of war, or along the road of cooperation, mutual understanding, and quest of accord? It seems the choice has been made. The task at present is to develop progress to a new, peaceful period in a calm and considered way."

Emphasis has been placed on the inter-relationship of domestic and international processes in both parts of Europe. As regards changes in East-European countries and in the USSR, they are very different for the conditions in which they started, economic possibilities, the level of political culture, historic heritage, etc. But they have the common tendency which favours the construction of a European home for it brings the countries closer, makes them more open, and creates new opportunities for communication and equal exchange.

It was noted with satisfaction that responsible politicians are aware of the seriousness and positive meaning of changes that impart greater stability to mutual security. Nevertheless, a balanced, constructive, in short appropriate conduct is ever more important in connection with events in different countries.

The Helsinki process develops in its specific contemporary forms. And it will be very dangerous if someone

tries, even if in a separate link, to return to what has already been the past stage of the process. This would mean to undermine it as a whole.

The depth and importance of changes dictate the need to step up the efforts, to meet each other halfway from the West and from the East. Both sides will be enriched by this reciprocal striving.

It is not time to destroy the established international political and economic institutions.

Let them transform themselves with taking into account internal processes, let them find themselves a niche in the new situation and interact.

It is useless to clamour about victory in the cold war, about the disintegration of some or other social system. Everything should be analyzed realistically and interests should be balanced. When accusations of "exporting revolutions" are replaced with calls for "exporting capitalism," we have at hand a dangerous manifestation of old thinking.

It is time to show consideration for the fact that the world today does not consist of two mutually exclusive civilizations. It is one common civilization in which human values and the freedom of choice have the primacy.

There exists a useful experience in solving most diverse problems in various societies. And the skill of contemporary politics is in using it to one's own and common benefit.

In our dynamic age there is a need for an intensive dialogue, Soviet-French dialogue, in particular, Gorbachev said. Therefore the question about a new meeting with the French president is quite timely.

The conversation was rich in substance and width of problems raised, which is characteristic of Soviet-French dialogue. Eduard Shevardnadze, Ambassadors Yakov Ryabov and Jean-Marie Merillion, and Director of the Political Department of the French Foreign Ministry Bertrand Dufourcq were present.

On Problem of German Reunification

LD1411204289 Paris Domestic Service in French 1800 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] French Foreign Affairs Minister Roland Dumas has been received by Mikhail Gorbachev. Roland Dumas was questioned as he left the Kremlin by [reporter] Ulysse Gosset:

[Begin Dumas recording] We both said that it is clear that Europe is leaving one historic period and entering another historic period. At present, responsible statesmen should be working to ensure that these movements do not destabilize Europe and that the risks do not increase, but on the contrary that they decrease. And that was the whole direction of our conversation. If there is a deep aspiration on the part of the German people for something which might be reunification or rapprochement, everyone is aware of that, but the problem is knowing whether that can be achieved. Now, we live in a balanced entity which is the result of postwar events (?it is true), but it is also the result of agreements which were concluded and treaties which were signed. So, to call all that into question would be such an unheaval that it is worth reflecting about beforehand. [end recording]

14 Nov Departure

LD1511024689 Moscow TASS in English 1800 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 14 TASS—French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas left the Soviet Union for home tonight upon the completion of an official visit.

At the airport, Dumas was seen off by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and other officials.

Mitterrand Telephones Gorbachev 14 Nov

LD1411152689 Paris Domestic Service in French 1400 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] Francois Mitterrand made a long telephone call this morning to Mikhail Gorbachev. The head of state, who is currently presiding over the EEC, is in practically constant consultations with all his European allies.

To Meet Gorbachev After Summit

LD1511112989 Paris Domestic Service in French 1100 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Francois Mitterrand and Mikhail Gorbachev will meet in an informal fashion at the end of December or the beginning of 1990. At any rate it will be after the U.S.-USSR meeting, but before the summit, which is due to bring the two men together in Moscow next spring or summer.

The Soviet leader is worried—and he stated this to Roland Dumas, the minister of foreign affairs—when he says that the West Europeans should not exploit the changes underway to affirm the superiority of capitalism over socialism.

Soviet-French Ties Transcend Bilateral Framework

PM1511102589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Yu. Kovalenko dispatch: "France-USSR: Building Europe Together"]

[Text] During French Foreign Minister R. Dumas' 2-day visit to the Soviet Union, which begins Monday, attention will be focused on a wide range of questions, including the recent events in the GDR, East-West relations, and cooperation between Moscow and Paris in resolving international problems and regional conflicts.

In addition, the upcoming talks will sum up French-Soviet links, which today, more than ever before, form part of the all-European process, and outline their development prospects.

The past year has been exceptionally fruitful for relations between our states. M.S. Gorbachev visited France and 22 agreements were signed during his visit. The heads of the USSR and French foreign policy departments have met around 10 times during 1989. Active consultations are being held on a wide range of problems. French journalists point out that these consultations are now almost as intensive as those that France has with its allies.

Eight Soviet-French working groups operate in the political sphere, including groups on disarmament problems, European affairs, North-South relations, the rule-of-law state, the Near East, Latin America, and other regions.

The Soviet-French meeting in Moscow is being attentively observed in all European capitals and across the ocean. This interest can be explained primarily by the fact that R. Dumas' talks with Soviet leaders are taking place at a time of unprecedented changes in the socialist countries. Their profundity and pace were a surprise to the West, which is now engaged in a search for a new model for its relations with the East.

According to R. Dumas, the processes taking place in the socialist countries are the most important events since the end of World War II. If they continue, the minister stated, we will see a "great reconciliation" of the whole of Europe.

Today, Paris believes, a totally new situation is unfolding on the old continent and a most important phase in its history is starting. And although France unanimously welcomes the changes, many people make no secret of their concern and wonder: How will relations between the two Europes develop? What is the future of the two Germanies and the status of West Berlin? What is the future of the two military blocs? Will the balance of forces not be upset? All these questions, Paris believes, will undoubtedly be raised at the talks in Moscow.

The dialogue between two countries which in the past helped bring about a rapprochement between East and West and establish the policy of detente assumes particular significance today. "Soviet-French concord is an irreplaceable element in the consolidation of the European community and necessary if Europe is to fulfill its mission with respect to its own peoples and the contemporary world as a whole," M.S. Gorbachev has noted.

The processes of democratization in the socialist countries are opening up new opportunities to implement the concept of a "common European home." The Soviet proposals were supported from the very beginning on the banks of the Seine, where political farsightedness was displayed.

The whole complex of disarmament problems will loom large at the meeting in Moscow. Both countries are fully determined to contribute to the success of the talks on a ban on chemical weapons and the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces.

Our initiative to discuss questions of minimum levels of deterrence at a meeting of representatives of the nuclear powers and also the states which have nuclear weapons based on their territory was greeted with attention here. For its part, Paris hopes that Moscow will change its approach toward the doctrine of nuclear deterrence, which, to all appearances, will remain the cornerstone of French defenses for the foreseeable future.

After the conclusion of a series of bilateral agreements, the two countries are faced with the complex task of giving concrete expression to them. In order to overcome existing problems, the current structures of cooperation will be changed and a single organ will be created instead of the "grand" and "small" commissions which used to deal with various aspects of it. Finally, an agreement on economic, industrial, scientific, and technical cooperation between the USSR and France will be signed in Moscow.

As far as the program of bilateral ties for 1990 is concerned, the main event will be the visit to the Soviet Union by President F. Mitterrand. To all appearances, an exchange of visits by our countries' prime ministers will also take place.

Cooperation between our countries goes far beyond the bilateral framework. It can play a key role in forming a new system of mutual relations between East and West and promote the deepening of all-European processes.

FRG View of GDR Travel Decision Questioned

LD1411161189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Talk by Bonn correspondent Aleksandr Pozharskiy]

[Text] The decision by the GDR leadership on free trips by citizens of the Republic to the FRG and West Berlin was received in Bonn political circles and by the public of that country in general as an important step of a political and humane nature. These events also made changes in the working calendar of the leading political figures of the country. FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl interrupted his visit to Poland for 24 hours, and other

West German political figures set off urgently to West Berlin and other border towns to see for themselves the events and maybe to inject a certain historic quality into these events by their presence.

It is certainly difficult to overestimate the significance of the political decision made by the GDR leadership. But it is possible to see in the reaction of the mass media and the speeches of some political figures of the FRG a desire to give it too great a symbolic coloring and to interpret it as the beginning of a great unification of the two German states. It is also possible to see a desire to exploit these events to put pressure on the GDR.

The FRG Government, Kohl said, calls on the party and state leadership of the GDR to open up the gates fully for fundamental changes in the state, economy, and society.

The decision of the GDR leadership on free trips, in my opinion, proves strikingly that the process of reform in the GDR is actively gaining strength. The GDR leadership and public will find during a wide-ranging internal dialogue the necessary ways to solve the existing problems. Any interference from West German political figures in that internal dialogue could not so much help as hinder it.

Economic Reform Conference

Further on All-Union Economic Reform Conference

Slyunkov, Abalkin Speeches Reported

PM1411120189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Nov 89 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Unattributed report: "Strategy and Tactics of Economic Reform. All-Union Scientific-Practical Conference"]

[Text] The "uncomfortable" word "crisis" with regard to us, which had been removed from our official vocabulary, has today come into use among politicians, commentators, and scientists, particularly if the talk turns to the economy. We have learned to take a straight look at things, however unpleasant they may be, and have realized anew the truth that we cannot progress while hiding our head under our wing.

Yes, the crisis of the economy, which was messed up during the years of inertia and stagnation, is a very unpleasant thing fraught with complications. But, as was rightly remarked in the debate at the party Central Committee on problems of economic development, a crisis is not a disaster. We have a real chance of emerging renewed from the crisis. Effective measures are needed to achieve this.

In which direction is the economy to go now? How are we to direct it toward the specific person? What is the substance of today's tactics and the long-term strategy for radical economic reform?

These and many other key questions for perestroyka have been submitted for discussion at the All-Union Scientific and Practical Conference on Problems of the Radical Economic Reform, which opened yesterday in the Hall of Columns of Moscow's House of Unions.

It was attended by M.S. Gorbachev, N.I. Ryzhkov, N.N. Slyunkov, V.A. Medvedev, A.P. Biryukova, Yu.A. Manayenkov, Ye.S. Stroyev, and G.I. Usmanov.

Delivering the introductory speech to the conference participants, N.N. Slyunkov said:

Comrades! Allow me to open the conference. The Party Central Committee attaches great significance to it. We regard the conference as the logical continuation of the discussion that took place on M.S. Gorbachev's initiative at the conference at the CPSU Central Committee with leading economic scientists.

A special feature of this conference is its scientific-practical nature.

The concept of economic reform was formulated by the Central Committee's June (1987) plenum. But it is being realized only slowly. The administrative-edict levers of management have been undermined, but economic levers have not yet come fully into force in daily practice. It is obvious that the economy cannot remain for long in this transitional state. There is no going back to the past; we must go forward.

The range of problems facing us is wide and complex, and a clear-cut plan of further action is needed.

It is necessary to impart a comprehensive nature to the economic reform and carry it out stage by stage and consistently, but the chief thing is to accelerate it decisively. We expect of all the conference participants—scientists, specialists, economic planners, party and soviet workers—a serious analysis, a businesslike discussion, and constructive proposals for deepening the reform and its main components.

Today we must exchange opinions and advice on how to ensure the introduction of an integrated, radical economic reform, accelerate the introduction and completion of the most important elements of the reform, track the processes taking place with greater speed and quality, and forestall and eliminate negative phenomena. We must build the course of work and monitor the timely implementation of the planned measures. We must rapidly ensure that the economy turns toward achieving good-quality end results and, through this, secure a turn toward social needs. We must organize the operation of economic mechanisms, the tax system, credit, banks, norms, and normatives so that money goes to those who have earned it. We must eradicate wage leveling and freeloading, adjust the mechanism of social protection, and preserve and augment socialist values and gains.

Perestroyka cannot be carried out at a stroke. The chief thing is how to accelerate it through deepening and accelerating economic reform. What is needed here is both collective reason and the actions and labor of each and every person. Constant questing, excellence in work, and a departure from stereotypes are needed here.

The conference provides an opportunity to exchange experience, to compare different viewpoints, and to formulate the optimum approach to resolving the set task.

From the entire diversity of opinions and proposals it is necessary to single out and realize all the main ones aimed at accelerating reform and renewing and strengthening socialism. Of course, the questions that will be discussed are not easy, and there may, naturally, be different assessments and different approaches regarding them. Account must be taken of the fact that the reform is associated with the fundamental breaking of social relations and affects the interests of all social groups and sections of the population. This process cannot proceed without pain and conflict, and new phenomena are not perceived unambiguously. In many ways public awareness has proved unprepared for radical changes in the economy, as adherence to stereotypes, to old methods of management, and to freeloading and wage leveling demonstrates.

The central question that we have to discuss is the question of ownership and of restructuring production relations, because this, as was emphasized back at the 27th party congress, is the key problem of our economy. Organically connected with this problem is the development of commodity-money relations, the formation of a socialist market, its state regulation, the reform of price formation, and the improvement of the whole finance and credit system and of foreign economic ties.

The new stage of the reform creates the need to carefully analyze the organizational structures of management, to abandon everything obsolete and inefficient, and to elaborate their optimum forms.

A common theme is the transfer of the republics and regions to the principles of self-management and self-financing. The task is to determine how to achieve the maximum acceleration of the socioeconomic development of the regions, the republics, and the country as a whole by means of economic accountability.

The training and retraining of cadres and the fostering of contemporary economic thinking in them are assuming very great significance for the reform's success. We should discuss this topic today as well, and exchange opinions and proposals with regard to this question.

Comrades! One of the chief tasks is to ensure the acceleration of scientific and technical progress. The subject "Creation of an Economic Mechanism for Managing Scientific and Technical Progress" must be examined comprehensively at our conference today. There is no doubt that only economic reform and scientific and technical progress can ensure the attainment of a really strong social policy, improved labor relations, and a strengthening of distribution according to labor. All these questions require very close attention. Because, in the final analysis, the goal and purpose of all our transformations are the interests of the working person and of his material and spiritual sphere.

In determining the stages and the speed of the economic reform, we must proceed from the actual economic situation in the economy today. We must, above all, normalize the situation in the consumer market, improve finances, and strengthen the ruble—this is a necessary precondition for deepening the reform and enhancing social production efficiency. Life has advanced a number of complex problems, and there is little time to resolve them. This increases our responsibility many times over and underlines the significance of our conference.

You know the conference program, which you all have in hand. Allow me to wish you fruitful work. [Slyunkov ends]

L.I. Abalkin took the floor to deliver the report "Radical Economic Reform—Priority and Long-Term Measures."

Report by Academician L.I. Abalkin

The speaker dwelled on three groups of questions. First of all, the concept of reform, its scientific foundations, and the specific features of the present-day situation. Second, the transitional period, the development of reform, and its historical content. And finally, the organization of work on the implementation of economic reform.

The concept of reform formulated by the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum constituted a far-reaching turn in our thinking and at the same time a return to the sources, to Lenin's concept of the shaping and management of socialism's economic system. Soviet society has literally paid for it through its sufferings and the hardships it has experienced, and today it provides the starting point which we use to determine practical steps and measures and to solve the accumulated questions.

A number of the reform's provisions and concepts are of fundamental importance, and there must be total clarity on these questions to ensure successful solution of all remaining problems.

First. The reform is radical in nature. This is no refurbishment of a decrepit building's facade but the demolition of the administrative-edicts system and its replacement by a qualitatively new model of the socialist economy. It must be said that the administrative system's shortcomings have been repeatedly criticized. Today it is sufficiently clear that it acts as a serious brake on the development of production forces and, perhaps, especially on the main production force, which is associated with labor.

Second. The economic reform is not an autonomous or isolated process, It is the basic element of perestroyka. It is impossible to achieve without radical reform of the political system and, at the same time, it emerges as a condition, a prerequisite for the country's radical political renewal and consistent democratization, as the economic basis of perestroyka.

Its implementation is associated with all strata of social life, with society's spiritual structure and its system of values.

Third. The depth and radical nature of the reform means that it affects not only the external forms and structures of economic life and not so much the composition and functions of central management organs and the system of financial and credit levers and tools, despite all their importance; it actually permeates the foundations of the economic system and is required to renew the entire totality of ownership relations, with all the wealth and diversity of those relations' development. Only thus will it be able to lead us to the set goals.

We must also be aware of the general logic of the unfolding reform. It began in the complex quest for

starting points, primarily in changing the conditions for activity by labor collectives, the basic links of our national economy.

The logic of the development of reform also entails the transition from separate, partial, and local transformations in the system of economic management and the completion of perestroyka as a system, in a package of interconnected changes.

Fourth. The reform, despite all the depth and radical nature of its transformations, is not aimed at replacing socialism by some other system or by an asexual [bespoloye] society; it is meant to renew socialism and give it a second wind. There is no room for reservations here. The socialist option is neither a slogan nor an ideological stereotype. It is the people's choice, and today it plays the role of a criterion for selecting the forms and methods for the building of various systems, structures, and economic relations, for the renewal of all economic life, including ownership relations.

Of course, the very concept of socialism must be extracted not from the dusty trunks left over from the past, but in accordance with the realities of the closing years of the 20th century, and it must be in line with the new views and the new evaluations that are taking shape on the basis of an interpretation of the lessons and the historical path we have covered.

We have embarked on the path of really renewing the relations of ownership, of shaping a complex and multifaceted structure of relations, and the depth of this approach is primarily determined by a recognition of the need for diversity itself, not by attempts—as so often happens in our country—to look beyond that diversity and find again some sort of single, universal form of relationship, applicable always and in all cases regardless of specific sectoral features, territorial distribution, cadre training, the nature of technological processes, and specific features of the organization and scale of production.

Perhaps the most complex problem we have encountered, the speaker emphasized, is how to arrive at solutions that make people the real masters. Here we have something to discuss, and we shall have special sections working on it. It is also essential to look at the substance of these problems.

It is by no means always necessary to be an owner in order to be a master, even though this view is quite firmly rooted and widespread among public opinion today.

We have also encountered a problem that requires adequate analysis, whereby people have not just failed to become but are frequently unwilling to become the real masters and take on not only the full range of rights associated with that but also the entire burden of responsibilities to be borne by a genuine master.

There must also be the utmost clarity on questions of shaping and developing the socialist market, of its inherent forms and methods for regulating the economy and combining market forms with state regulation of national economic processes.

Today we have advanced far enough in the understanding of problems. There is no need to confuse the market with the market place. The establishment of a market does not mean moving back to the 19th century. A developed market, subject to very complex regulations and built into the economic mechanism, is today typical of all countries with a relatively effective economy.

But there are also practical problems that we have to ponder. There are diverse perceptions of the possibilities for and ways of shaping the socialist market. There is a widely held opinion that complete balance has to be ensured in the national economy from the outset, in advance, that existing imbalances have to be eliminated, and that only on that basis can elements of market regulation of the economy be introduced. This is, of course, a tempting way to present the problem which—if truth be told—does not answer the question why we have been unable all this time, for decades on end, to achieve this without using elements of market regulation.

This is not a question of recklessly plunging in at the deep end of the market and trying to use it as a basis for regulating processes, including those in the economic sphere; it is a question of understanding the complexity of interaction whereby the shaping of the socialist market is simultaneously a prerequisite for and a result of perestroyka in the structure of the national economy and of targeted efforts to bring it into balance. It must also be clearly understood that the shaping of market methods does not at all mean rejection of state regulation, even though it alters the latter's substance, the structure of its elements, and its methods of activity. It is perfectly clear that the state retains a virtually exclusive position in the shaping and development of the production and social infrastructure, ensuring the integrity of the national economy and the shaping of general rules of economic behavior, regulated by means of laws and norms of socialist economic management.

It is necessary, L.I. Abalkin went on, to clearly distinguish two concepts associated, on the one hand, with an attempt to make the people happy through the leadership's will, by pursuing this plan for reorganization of reform and program. It is important to make the reform, just like the entire process of perestroyka, the work of the masses themselves, to discover the political, economic, social, and psychological moves that would set the reform in motion, because this is the only source of success, the future, and the solution of fundamental problems associated with our transformations.

Now to turn to the real situation in which we find ourselves and toward which we should make further progress, defining our short-term prospects. It should be said that this situation is quite complex and considerably

unfavorable. We are also finding an increase in social complaints linked with the expected improvement in the state of affairs in the economy, the living standard of whole strata of the population, and, at the same time, the need to simultaneously implement methods of strict financial control and regulation and to carry out unpopular measures. This too should be clearly realized, because if we fail to take these steps or to implement these tough and unpopular measures we will again be backtracking by several years and returning to new attempts to live beyond our means, to pay with assets that have not been created, and to inflate our spending without reference to income. That is why, when we now take these steps, we must clearly realize just what is involved in this entire reform program and in the program of the first steps to improve the economy.

The plan and budget for 1990 already contain a whole series of fundamentally new approaches, and in many cases a new philosophy of budgetary financing for the national economy which, I think, we have perhaps not yet recognized in science and probably in public awareness. Through the supreme power of the law we have established on a normative basis the size of the budget deficit—its maximum level. And then we wrote that state budget spending would be financed out of actual earned income. This income may, to all intents and purposes, be less than required, which would mean that a number of programs and promises planned for this year would not be implemented. In general, we must learn to live realistically, within our means: Living within our means applies to workers, labor collectives, regions, and, for instance, whole republics.

A key avenue of the radical reform is the development of republic principles of self-management and self-financing, as well as regional forms of economic accountability. And many people expect that, when things switch over as of 1 January 1990 or 1 January 1991, everything will suddenly get better. But things cannot get better for everyone simultaneously. If nothing has changed in production itself, things will only get better for one group at the expense of others. The potential for altering the situation has been exhausted.

And finally, the situation itself. Before holding the conference which has now opened, we asked the All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion to carry out a special research project, a definite opinion poll into the population's attitude to the radical economic reform. The material has been collated at that information center.

It should be said that expectations are exhausted and a lack of faith has emerged as regards the possibility of rapidly improving the state of affairs in the economy. To a certain extent doubt has also started emerging about the correctness of the choice we have made.

Among those who answered the question "What has produced the current economic difficulties?" most people believe that it was caused by mistakes in the past and in our time. On the whole more than 70 percent believe that this is the precise cause of the difficulties. Another point should put us on our guard: 20.2 percent of those polled said that the cause of our difficulties lay in the very nature of socialism rather than in certain mistakes, deformations, or shortcomings. This is very serious. It is connected with the great doubts that have emerged for various reasons, and by no means always spontaneously.

The speaker then moved on to describe the transitional period and the main stages of the reform.

The very manner of raising the question of the need to scrap one system of economic management and shape another to replace it presupposes that this will take more than just time and effort and a purposeful program of measures. And we have already been most forcefully confronted with the complexities involved in elaborating a program of transitional measures. If we take the starting points and the final positions, then everything looks clear. The old system won't do—there's absolutely no question of that. So where do we go?

We have run into a complete absence of theory to cover the transition movements. Yet is it precisely such a theory that is needed to answer the question of how and in what manner, using what methods, and in what sequence this program of measures is to be implemented. Moreover we have to be able to see the complexities in this process and the dangers lying in wait for us on the way.

The point is that the prolonged coexistence of elements of an old and a new system always creates serious danger and preserves the inertia for a return to the past, and these factors are intensified by the growth of negative phenomena in the economy and by a receptiveness and credulity in public awareness toward the idea that, if we turn back, everything will immediately get better.

The following danger also exists: that the tactics to which we are forced to resort in this complex economic situation will be turned into a strategy, into a long-term program. But it is dangerous to make a line out of this, to lose the country's prospects and its future for the sake of an immediate effect.

So what does need to be done in this instance? First and foremost we need a consistent line against which we can measure each step and check whether or not that step conforms to the transformations planned. The general question arises of the need to embody in normative and legislative form the main tenets, principles, directions, and stages of the radical economic reform so that, when we adopt any law or sublegislative act, we have sufficient guarantee that it does not contradict established norms.

Experience shows that it is necessary to create a kind of critical mass of new elements, because innovation dissipated among separate elements proves powerless and

unviable. A definite accumulation of critical new-element mass is needed, with the capacity when combined to break down the inertia of the system and set in motion what is usually called a qualitatively new course in social development.

If we act in a sufficiently vigorous and balanced fashion, then there is a basis for hoping that we could get through the transitional period in a relatively short space of time—5-6 years—provided we make an enormous effort. And we will have to pass through a number of stages in these 5 or 6 years.

The first stage seems relatively short: It should cover the period up to the end of next year. In terms of content it will be more of a preparatory stage—I would even go so far as to use the concept of pretransitional stage. But, despite its brevity, we will face the need to resolve a number of major actions during this short period.

Above all, we need to clear our economic foundations—the construction site for these radical transformations—to halt the growth of negative trends, to take the first real steps toward financially reviving the economy and stabilizing the consumer market, and to implement the measures elaborated by the government and approved by the Supreme Soviet in this sphere.

Part two is linked with the fact that during this very brief period we must prepare a whole range of measures and solutions needed in order to get the economic mechanism of the transitional period moving.

Above all, I am thinking of preparations for a whole package of laws that are currently being examined by the Supreme Soviet, and a number of other laws that have not yet been submitted for examination. These could be laws on the banking system, antimonopoly measures, and a number of other acts of legislation which, taken together, should constitute an integrated system rather than an incoherent collection.

But there is also a part three, which is no less important for future success. I am talking about the need to achieve within this period a breakthrough in the sociopsychological situation in the country and to win back the people's support and faith in the country's leadership in order to curb the development of negative processes and get the country out of its crisis. This is not merely a question of assurances and promises, it is a question of carrying out a whole program of economic measures and actions able to curb this trend.

We need to achieve social consensus—a truce, if you like—and to recognize the danger of rocking the common boat in which we all find ourselves.

Finally, it must be borne in mind that, as of 1991, the entire country—all 15 union republics, each oblast, and perhaps each city—will switch to development in a situation of self-management, self-financing, and regional economic accountability. This is a fundamentally new situation.

It is during these second-stage years—the early nineties—that reform of the banking system should be completed, a modern interest-rate [protsentnyy] policy introduced, and wholesale trade in the means of production developed. The sphere of contractual, quota-based, and free prices, perhaps synchronized with each other, will be expanded at the same time as market relations. In other words, a fundamentally important step should be taken in switching to a socialist market and in changing management and regulation methods.

Expanding the market, we should create a system of economic regulators, including a special system of anti-inflationary spheres —not least the use of an excess-profits tax, a tough measure but one that is well-tested in world practice.

It is planned also to set up an adequate system of regulatory and financial control organs, tax and price inspectorates, a monopolies committee, and other organizations in the structure of management. These will serve the economic regulation mechanism rather than the administrative control system. And this system will have to be staffed with highly professional and highly paid cadres.

And, finally, in connection with the development of these processes we need to simultaneously introduce a system of special mechanisms for the social protection of the population. Once we embrace this system, we must foresee and forestall any possible consequences of it....

The resolution of all these problems taken together will make it possible for us to enter stage three of the reform, provided that we successfully solve the tasks of stages one and two. We could embark on stage three by the middle of the 5-year plan—that is, by 1993. This will be a period when the range of reciprocal avenues of economic reform measures will bed in, start to work, and begin producing their first results. The economic and social returns from the new economic mechanism will start to grow.

The speaker then switched to a group of questions linked with the organization of the work to implement the economic reform itself. It should be clearly realized that people can make as many clever proposals and fine speeches, and draw up as many plans as they like, but that these are doomed to failure if they are not backed up by a clear-cut and strict organizational structure for all this work. We should take account of accumulated experience, a whole series of trends in world experience, and, in general, certain promising management trends from which, clearly, we can usefully learn.

One of the most complex problems, which cannot be solved at one fell swoop or altered by any decree, is the shaping of the cadre corps—those who will have to implement the reform.

In general, the speaker said in conclusion, we, as conference participants and representatives of science and practical work, should demonstrate our ability to seek

the truth, to find a way out of the prevailing situation, and to act cohesively, guided by a common purpose.

Taking part in the debate were: N.Ya. Petrakov, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Central Economics and Mathematics Institute; A.G. Aganbegyan, academician-secretary of the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics Department; V.S. Pavlov, USSR finance minister; S.S. Shatalin, department chief at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics and the Forecasting of Scientific and Technical Progress; S.I. Gurenko, secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee; V.V. Gerashchenko, chairman of the USSR State Bank Board; O.T. Bogomolov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics of the World Socialist System Institute; Yu.V. Skokov, chairman of the board at the "Kvant" State Intersectoral Association; G.Kh. Popov, chief editor of the journal VOPROSY EKONOMIKI; V.F. Yakovlev, USSR minister of justice; G.S. Khizha, president of the Leningrad Association of State Enterprises and general director of the "Svetlana" Production Association; R.A. Ubaydullayeva, deputy director of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Academy of Sciences Economics Institute; P.G. Bunich, faculty chief at the Moscow Management Institute; L.D. Yaroshenko, participant in the 1951 economic discussion [as published]; I.Ya. Kremenetskiy, general director of the "Moskva" Sewn Goods Association; I.I. Lukinov, vice president of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences and director of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Economics Institute; K.T. Turysov, secretary of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, and others.

Accounts of the debate speeches will be published.

The conference continues today and tomorrow.

Supreme Soviet Session

PRAVDA Report on 10 Nov Presidium Session

PM1411141989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 89 Second Edition pp 1, 3

[TASS report: "USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Session"]

[Text] A USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium session was held in the Kremlin 10 November under the chairmanship of M.S. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The session discussed proposals for dates to convene the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies and items proposed for inclusion on the Congress agenda. A decision was adopted to submit these proposals for consideration to the USSR Supreme Soviet. The Presidium formed a commission to resolve practical questions connected with the preparation and holding of the Second Congress of People's Deputies. It includes representatives of all the union republics and of the committees and permanent commissions of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet, people's deputies, and representatives of the government.

The draft USSR Supreme Soviet declaration on the full political rehabilitation of peoples subjected to forcible resettlement, which will be submitted for consideration to the USSR Supreme Soviet, was discussed and approved.

An information report by D.A. Kerimov, chairman of the Commission to Prepare the Draft Law on Constitutional Oversight in the USSR, on the completion of work on the drafts of this law and of a new version of Article 125 of the USSR Constitution was heard. The said drafts are being submitted for consideration to the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

The session devoted great attention to a discussion of the question of the disparity between certain norms of union republic legislative acts and the USSR Fundamental Law. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium recognized that, because of Article 74 of the USSR Constitution, such norms cannot operate on the republics' territory because they are at variance with the provisions of the union Constitution. In this connection the Supreme Soviet Presidiums of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], the Lithuanian SSR, the Latvian SSR, and the Estonian SSR are instructed to take measures to bring the republics' legislative acts into line with the USSR Constitution.

Pointing out that instances of a number of persons being groundlessly deprived of Soviet citizenship in connection with their emigration and statements abroad occurred in the seventies and eighties, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium deemed it expedient to continue work on restoring the said persons' rights if they express a desire to regain USSR citizenship. As is known, some of these persons have already had Soviet citizenship restored and have returned to the motherland.

The Presidium session approved the initiative of a number of members of the Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order Committee and the International Affairs Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet to create a USSR people's deputies club under the Supreme Soviet.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium appro[illegible]d Doctor of Juridical Sciences Prof M.I. Piskotin as chief editor of the journal NARODNYY DEPUTAT.

Fedorov Defends Lenin's Stance on Role of Party

LD1411193489

[Editorial Report] The following is an addition to the item entitled "13 Nov Session Recapped; Gorbachev Cited," which was published on pages 64-68 of the 14 November Soviet Union DAILY REPORT. The following passages supply Deputy Fedorov's remarks at the

13 November Supreme Soviet Session, which were omitted from the referent item:

Page 67, column one, paragraph 6 should read: "[Begin recording] [Fedorov] Our Communist Party is the ruling party because it won the elections, the democratic elections to the soviets. It will, however, remain the ruling party even after it loses the elections somewhere—let us assume this possibility—and this, thanks to Article 6 of the Constitution. This is because it says that no matter what the situation is and no matter who leads it, who stands at the helm of the party—Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, or, say, Chernenko, or, I don't know, a Smirnov—the party will, all the same, be the ruling party, because there is a formula that this party fulfills a leading and guiding role.

There are cardinally..." (supplying omitted passage; picking up paragraph seven);

Page 67, column two, paragraph two, from last sentence should read: "...lagging behind again. Article 6 of the Constitution first emerged in 1977. There is nothing of the kind in the Leninist 1918 Constitution. There is nothing of the kind in the 1924 Constitution. There is nothing like that even in Stalin's Constitution. But it emerged for the first time in 1977, at the apogee of the stagnation period. One can understand the considerations that prompted this norm to be thought up.

The next thing is this: I think that the prestige of the party and the vanguard role of the party and the prestige of true communists will only be elevated as a result of a good, thorough, serious—well, I do not know whether a discussion is needed at all here—but as a result of a thorough, scientific approach, taking into account what is taking place in the world and in the socialist countries. The time has come to have this problem resolved, all the more so because the election campaign will soon burst out on us and the opportunity will again arise for interpreting this article incorrectly: It will again be possible to accuse some people, especially those candidate people's deputies who will campaign for a restoration of the Soviet power, as has repeatedly been proclaimed by the party Central Committee, to accuse them of allegedly violating Article 6 of the Constitution.

I think, comrade communists, that if one takes a look at what Lenin taught about the party's leading role, you will find nothing there that would hint at a possibility of the emergence of a constitutional-legal mean mechanism safeguarding a leading role for the party. Constitutional-legal means compulsory: Laws entail compulsion. Lenin had but one idea running through all his works, that the party affirms its leading role as a result. It should prove, it should earn by, if you like, wise, honest and conscientious toil the right to be the moral and the ideological leader and no more than that, and the people choose and follow such a party, while everything else is the crudest violation of both the Leninist concept of the party's leading role and the Leninist concept of socialism as well as a violation of the formula of law-governed state. And I, as a communist, would not like to be accused of having launched a sortie or an attack against the party because I am not at all confident that those who cling to this compulsory mechanism of ensuring the party's leading role care more for the prestige of the party. [passage omitted: Deputy Irena Andreyeva..." (supplying omitted Fedorov remarks; picking up last sentence of paragraph two).

Moscow TV Relay of 14 Nov Supreme Soviet Session

1600 GMT

LD1411174589

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1600 GMT on 14 November begins carrying a recorded relay of the 14 November Supreme Soviet session at the Kremlin in Moscow.

The session is chaired by Anatoliy Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

At 1601 GMT Lukyanov opens the session. Registration of Supreme Soviet members takes place.

The issue of ownership is proposed for discussion; the issue of amnesty for servicemen in Afghanistan is adjourned. A statement linked to the birth anniversary of Nehru is proposed for adoption. Dzasokhov reads out the draft statement praising Nehru's achievements. The draft statement is adopted with three abstentions, all others in favor.

At 1612 GMT Lukyanov opens discussion on the law on ownership. The work of the relevant commission is summed up. Alekseyev then takes the floor. The draft has been perfected and should be published as soon as possible. He decribes the main provisions of the draft, stressing their innovative nature. Land belongs to the people and not to the state any more. Land belongs to the peoples who reside on the given territory. Land is given to peasants and can be inherited, but cannot be sold. Land cannot be confiscated. Alekseyev reads a question on people's ownership about sanctions against those who misuse land.

At 1632 GMT Deputy Boyko takes the floor. He comments on the various aspects of ownership. Private property may be different, and socialist private property is feasible.

Lukyanov suggests that debates on the draft should be limited to an hour, each speaker should be given 5 minutes because the question is only of publishing the draft.

At 1646 GMT an unidentified deputy asks Alekseyev about Article 23. If the people own the land, can it secede from a republic and take the land with it? Alekseyev elaborates on the subject, explaining differences between land and territory. Deputy Osipov wants a free discussion, as the issue is too important. Shapkhayev asks

another question on the right to take the floor. Sobchak says only proposals should be listened to today. Larionov from Yakut ASSR says the draft should be published as soon as possible. Land should be property of all state national formations. Deputy Minasbekyan from Yerevan says autonomous formations should have the same rights as union republics.

At 1701 GMT there is a 15-minute break in relay; a cartoon is shown. At 1715 GMT the relay resumes, with Deputy Shapkhayev saying Article 23 is contradictory, the right of autonomous and union republics is not delimited properly. At 1717 GMT Deputy Sokolov says the following on prices and the market economy: "[Sokolov] Esteemed comrades, deputies: Having regarded the question of property as of paramount importance in the economic reform, we are making the usual mistake. Whatever label we hang on the means of production will make little difference. We remain captives of the erroneous aim of how to make a person work more intensively and more conscientiously. But, after all, this is not the main issue now. The main issue now is to turn the consumer into the commander of the productive forces.

"Sometimes it is said that we live as we work. This is not true. We live far worse than we work, because we are not producing the output required. The efficiency of our econmy is to be estimated probably at a few percentages. What did we do when we introduced financial autonomy and self-financing? The whole coountry—like children—started playing at figures; revenue, expenditure, profit, profitability. Having raised the price, you increased the revenue, you increased the wages fund. How simple all this is. We are indeed living in the kingdom of distorting mirrors of state prices.

"[Lukyanov] Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, in spite of your request, I will interrupt you, nevertheless, because we firmly agreed...

"[Sokolov, interrupting] That is to say, (you do not wish) to give me the floor?

"[Lukyanov] No, no, no. We firmly agreed that if you have a proposal regarding the text...

"[Sokolov] I have a proposal.

"[Lukyanov] Go ahead.

"[Sokolov] I request that you give me the floor.

"[Lukyanov] Let us hear it.

"[Sokolov] The question of prices, not of property, is the central question of our economy.

"Will we have the price of the consumer or will we have the price of the bureaucrat and the producer? If we recognize the necessity of a market price—and we will have to do this—then at once an avalanche of questions arises. Mikhail Sergeyevich quite rightly told our market men that simply introducing market prices would bring the people out onto the streets in 2 weeks, who would sweep away any government. Example: Poland.

"We need to know how we can painlessly and quickly get to the market. Who will give us this knowledge? We already know who of the scientists says what. In this environment it is difficult to expect new knowledge. Moreover, all market men proceed from money circulation. Investments in shares and banks in this case are a necessary instrument for the development of industry.

Without a capitalist percentage, industry will not develop. Well then, this is no longer socialism.

"Esteemed comrade deputies, I came to this rostrum to make an exceptionally important statement. We are now attempting to create the working drawings for the economic reform without an integral concept for restructuring our economy. Moreover, we do not know what socialism is. I believe that we will not be able to answer this question as long as we do not pay close attention to the new economic theory of Comrade Chukhanov, who also comes from Kuybyshev. I understand the scepticism and smiles of those present in the hall, but in most economists, when meeting with him, the scepticism and smiles were quickly dispelled. Can you imagine: a market economy without money circulation, without profit, and even without ownership of means of production, but with market prices, with powerful competition, with very strong regulators, and on the whole with all positive qualities of the market. Such an economy commands an unlimited seller's market, while at the same time being socialism.

"Comrade deputies, Anatoliy Ivanovich [Lukyanov], will we really wait until the West makes use of our knowledge, while we do not? Materials regarding the controlled socialist market economy without dividends, interests, and taxes were handed over by me to the Presidium yesterday. Thank you."

Lukyanov then says that the proposals on which Sokolov based his speech will be circulated.

1722 GMT

LD1411190589

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1722 GMT on 14 November continues its recorded relay of the 14 November Supreme Soviet session at the Kremlin in Moscow.

Deputy Plotnieks says that Articles 22 and 23 contradict each other. It should be made clear who is the real owner, the USSR or the republics.

At 1727 GMT Deputy Denisov says the draft submitted by the ecological committee should be published, too. Deputy Sazonov says there is no mechanism for implementing this law. People violating it should be taken to court, he says. Sazonov notes that there are elements of private property in the country, anyway; for example, in cooperatives. Unlike the miners, cooperative members

have no complaints about their working conditions, he says, and concludes that autonomous republics should be supported.

At 1731 GMT, Deputy Bichkauskas takes the podium:

"[Bichkauskas] Esteemed Supreme Soviet, perhaps I shall depart from specific formulations, but I hope that I still have 5 minutes. I would like to read a statement from the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR].

"[Lukyanov] No. Statements or proposals on the text.

"[Bichkauskas] This statement is on the essence of the matter. I hope, Anatoliy Ivanovich, that we agreed on 5 minutes each.

"[Lukyanov] Five minutes, then, please.

"[Bichkauskas] No more. [objections from the hall] Esteemed Supreme Soviet, another Supreme Soviet has a message for you, the Supreme Soviet of a sovereign republic; please display respect and listen to it.

"The Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, fulfilling the will of the inhabitants of Lithuania, states that the articles of the USSR draft law on property in the USSR, examined at the second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which concern the relationship between the property of the republics and that of the USSR are unacceptable for Lithuania. They contradict in essence Article 11 of the Constitution, the Basic Law of the Lithuanian SSR, and the Law on the Bases of the Economic Autonomy of the Lithuanian SSR, which were adopted on 18 May, 1989 at the 11th session of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet. In those laws of the Lithuanian SSR, it is set out that its land, subsoil, internal and territorial waters, forests, and other natural resources are the exclusive property of the Lithuanian SSR and form the economic basis of the republic's sovereignty.

"The versions of the articles of the draft proposed by the USSR Government arouse justified concern among the inhabitants of Lithuania. If they are adopted, the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet would be obliged, guided by Article 70 of the constitution of the Lithuanian SSR, to stop the operation of the USSR Law on Property in the USSR on the territory of the Lithuanian SSR.

"In order to avoid adopting extreme decisions, the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet proposes stating in the law on property in the USSR the right of the republics to property over land, other natural resources, and the state of properties located on their territories. We consider it appropriate that the USSR Supreme Soviet should adopt a law regulating only all-union property, which would regulate only the subjects and objects of this property and the property relations between the republics. We propose that the USSR Supreme Soviet should examine, as one of the possible versions, the proposed draft law on property in the USSR elaborated by the Lithuanian SSR. I shall pass on this draft. I have a few minutes left.

"[Lukyanov] You have 1 minute please. A few minutes.

"[Bichkauskas] No doubt people are bewildered as to why these Lithuanians are so jumpy. I, too, would be bewildered if I were to proceed from the presumption of voluntariness in the setting up of the USSR. I do not deny that several republics united into a voluntary union. They should know this better than me. But where the Baltic republics are concerned, I deny this totally. In 1939-40 Stalin and his clique committed an act of state intervention and took the independence of Lithuania away from us. However, even he did not resort to legislation to encroach on what we hold sacred, our land.

"Esteemed Supreme Soviet, our electors, and personally my electors, did not give me the perogative, I repeat, to vote or, in general, even to take part in discussion of the transfer even to joint property of the land of Lithuania. Excuse and understand correctly why the delegation of Lithuania will not be taking part in the voting. Thank you for your attention. This is not an ultimatum."

At 1736 GMT Deputy Akhromeyev says the chairman seems to be giving the floor to those who are very pushy, and that people should be called to order, like the previous speaker. His statement is applauded. Deputy Chelyshev says alternative drafts should be published. Deputy Kosygin then says that autonomous republics should have the same rights as union republics. Deputy Burbulis says the draft should be published immediately, because this law raises the issue of power in the country. A special group should be set up to monitor nationwide discussion of the draft, he concludes.

At 1745 GMT Deputy Yablokov says there are ecological errors in the draft; air is also an object of ownership. He also says Akhromeyev's remarks were wrong. Deputy Prunskene says that only union property can be discussed here; republics should take care of themselves, with regard to their specific features. First, a law on the union should be adopted, he notes. An unidentified deputy replies that more power should be given to autonomous formation. In the draft, the legislation of autonomous republics is not taken into account, he says. Deputy Stepanov then says that Article 23 needs elaboration. Deputy Advadze says that first union republics should be consulted about their view of the draft.

At 1800 GMT Deputy Krivoruchko, speaking in Ukrainian asks, who is going to take the land? Villages are dying, nobody wants to work on the land, he says. First, proper conditions for living in rural areas should be ensured, he concludes. Deputy Boldyrev elaborates on more precise use of terms.

At 1808 GMT Lukyanov intervenes, saying 20 people have taken part in discussion. By voting, discussion is closed. A 20-minute break is announced, concluding the morning session.

1811 GMT

LD1411201489

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1811 GMT on 14 November continues its recorded relay from the 14 November session of the USSR Supreme Soviet at the Kremlin in Moscow.

The afternoon session opens with Deputy Yuriy Khamzatovich Kalmykov taking the floor. He says that about 14 detailed reviews of the draft have been received, positive and negative. He sums up the main recommendations and amendments. At 1825 GMT Alekseyev says we are taking an intermediary decision now, not final voting. He suggests that they continue discussing the draft in the media, but also recommend it for publication with all accompanying documents. He says a commission for monitoring public discussion is required. Lukyanov puts the proposal for publishing the draft. Voices from the floor are indistinct. Alekseyev clarifies that the proposal on autonomous republics should be published later. A deputy from Estonia raises a question on publication. Lukyanov tries to put the draft to a vote. Deputy Kugultinov says the proposals from autonomous republics should be included.

At 1838 GMT Lukyanov puts the draft to the vote: 286 for, 49 against, 15 abstained; 350 voted. Voices from the floor say there is no quorum. Reregistering takes place: 436 are present. Follwoing a commotion in the audience, an unidentified voice demands that an alternative draft be published. Voting on whether to publish the draft is repeated. 310 for, 21 against, 23 abstained; 354 voted altogether. The draft has been approved for publication, Lukyanov says.

At 1845 GMT the amendment submitted by autonomous republics on Article 23 giving them equal ownership rights with union republics is discussed. Alekseyev gives clarifications. Deputy Sobchak says this is an empty argument. The proposals of autonomous republics are making little sense; the draft should be put in a different shape and published, he concludes.

Lukyanov calls for a vote on whether to include the amendment in the draft or to publish it for discussion. A woman deputy says that deputies should not manipulate public opinion, and that there should be more respect for opinions. Lukyanov then reiterates his proposal on voting.

At 1854 GMT a deputy from Kara-Kalpak Autonomous Oblast says that he supports deputies from autonomous oblasts and this amendment should be introduced in the draft. Deputy Belozertsev says that the wording about legislations of autonomous oblasts should be included in the draft. Deputy Krayko asks why are we against this publication? We should publish it together with other proposals, he says. An unidentified deputy from Georgia says that everybody should be listened to.

At 1900 GMT Lukyanov puts the inclusion of the autonomous oblast amendment to the vote. 190 for, 185 against, 37 abstained. 412 total. As there is no majority, the amendment will be published as an alternative, Lukyanov says. Deputy Alekseyev then gives clarifications on legislation of autonomous and union republics. Lukyanov puts the proposal to the vote: 309 for, 45 against, 36 abstained.

At 1906 GMT Lukyanov puts the publication of the drafts of the ecological committee and the Lithuanian SSR to the vote. It is suggested from the floor that time for their publication be given. It is agreed that a week after the main draft is sufficient. voting: 379 for, 20 against, 16 abstained.

At 1910 GMT Lukyanov invites Alekseyev to speak about Plotnieks' proposal concerning Articles 23-25. A Baltic deputy gives his clarifications on the subject. Lukyanov then puts the issue to the vote: 306 for, 23 against, 21 abstained.

At 1915 GMT Lukyanov says the Presidium should be tasked with setting up a commission monitoring nationwide discussion. It is adopted without voting.

1916 GMT

LD1411205989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1916 GMT on 14 November continues its recorded relay of the 14 November session of the USSR Supreme Soviet at the Kremlin in Moscow.

Deputy Minnullin says from the floor that many more people support the amendment on autonomous oblasts. Lukyanov then proposes to discuss a law on local self-administration. Deputy Pivovarov says from the rostrum that his committee asks to ensure that the draft be published and nationwide discussion be held.

Deputy Obolenskiy suggests from the floor that it should be published together with the draft on taxation.

At 1925 GMT Lukyanov puts the publication of the self-administration draft to the vote: 387 for, 4 against, 9 abstained. This concludes the afternoon session.

Primakov is in the chair for the evening session. Items on the agenda rehabilitation of resettled peoples and Burlatskiy's brief on the deputies' club. At 1928 GMT The floor is given to Comrade Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, to speak on the first issue about a declaration on the full political rehabilitation of the peoples who were subjected to forcible resettlement:

"[Nishanov] Esteemed comrade deputies, the party's new political course started in April 1985 has created real possibilities and necessary conditions for solving issues related to lifting charges against entire peoples. It has become possible to implement a full political rehabilitation of peoples who were subjected to forcible resettlement during the personality cult. As you all know very well, these issues were raised more than once at the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies, at the first

session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and also in numerous publications in the press and speeches at rallies and public meetings. All the peoples of our country, without exception, suffered tragic losses during the personality cult. The topic of a full political rehabilitation of the people who suffered repressions and forcible resettlement was one of the central ones at the September plenum of our party's Central Committee, too.

"The CPSU Platform on issues of the party's nationality policy in today's conditions stresses that mass repressions, especially the resettlement of entire peoples from their traditional places of residence to other republics and regions, are one of the serious causes of the exacerbation of nationality problems. The platform says that, although after the 20th party congress many antidemocratic decisions, which trampled upon human rights, were condemned and abolished, it has not been possible to eliminate in all cases the consequences of the unlawfulness that was committed. The presence of this problem can be felt today, too. Taking into account the extreme importance of this problem at the present stage, Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, addressed members of the USSR Supreme Soviet and all the people's deputies of the Soviet Union who are taking part in the session's work with a letter saying that the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium think it expedient to adopt at the Supreme Soviet session a declaration of full rehabilitation of the peoples subjected to forcible resettlement during Stalin's personality cult.

"This document resolutely condemns the forcible resettlement of peoples as an antisocialist and absolutely unlawful practice. It is proposed to give a political, legal, and moral evaluation of the Stalinist reprisals and violence as a crime against Soviet peoples. Special attention is paid to the fact that a legislative rehabilitation of repressed peoples will have great importance for strengthening the national dignity of each nation, restoring historical truth, improving public morale, and consolidating the masses on the platform of perestroyka.

"The draft declaration, proposed for your attention, on a full political rehabilitation of peoples subjected to forcible resettlement will also become a legal act guaranteeing against similar practices, which crudely violate human rights and elementary norms of humaneness, ever recurring in our country. The declaration proclaims full political rehabilitation of all repressed peoples and condemns without reservation the practice of forcible resettlement, which took place, as one of the most grave crimes contradicting the very nature of the socialist system and the principles of democracy and lawfulness. The draft declaration has been unanimously approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and is submitted for your examination, esteemed deputies."

At 1939 Primakov ask for questions. Deputy Karyakin notes that the rehabilitation of the Crimean Tatars has not produced concrete results. Will this be improved upon, he asks. Nishanov responds that commissions are working on the problem. A deputy from Moldavia asks about the total number of deportees. Primakov says that he does not have the figures.

Deputy Kugultinov relates that, as a Kalmyk he was incarcerated under the resettlements; peoples cannot be rehabilitated, as they cannot commit crimes. Deputy Kugultinov thanks the other peoples of the USSR for their support. He quotes Gorbachev on this matter. At 1948 Kugultinov points out Kalinin's direct responsibility for such crimes:

"[Kugultinov] Why is it that we experience great calamities and no one ever answers for this? Here is the decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the abolition of the Kalmyk Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] and the formation of the Astrakhan Oblast. This decree says: All Kalmyks living on the territory of the Kalmyk ASSR are to be resettled in other areas and the Kalmyk republic is to be abolished. [Signed] Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Mikhail Kalinin. He signed this when his wife was scraping nits from the linen of prisoners in one of the camps in Kazakhstan. This former true Leninist, who degenerated into a Judas, signed not only this document but many, many, many disgraceful documents. But you and I walk along Prospekt Kalinina and look at a monument to him. Why is it that we find it so difficult to part with our disgraceful past, and is it not this which explains to some extent the drop in our prestige? Is this not the reason that we are unable not only to finally part with our past, but for some reason are afraid of it? One should not do this, and this declaration is a declaration which is awaited by all Crimean Tatars, and Germans, and Turks, who are weeping today. And you know, these lists of ours lack the names of other peoples, other peoples who suffered just such a calamity and sorrow."

At 1957 GMT Deputy Oleynik suggests alternative wording for the declaration. Deputy Foteyev calls for glasnost of all the circumstances of the deportations and complete rehabilitation. Nishanov points out that this is a declaration not a decision or a law under discussion. Specific proposals will come later, he says. Deputy Avtorkhanov then tells of the hard lot of the people of Chechen-Ingushetia. He proposes annulling all decrees on resettling peoples.

At 2012 GMT Deputy Obolenskiy expresses support for the repressed peoples. He notes the good work done by the memorial society and expresses surprise that it has not yet been registered officially. He suggests measures for their return to their homelands and for compensation.

At 2017 GMT Deputy Antanaytis speaks about the peoples of the Baltic republics who were all forcibly resettled into the USSR:

"[Antanaytis] Esteemed Supreme Soviet, esteemed guests! A declaration of full political rehabilitation of peoples is necessary on the path toward a law-governed

state. The peoples of the Soviet Union and the world have been waiting for such a document. And it seems that we all, as one, will support this document. The declaration, however, is not a final document. It should be supplemented. The declaration should be supplemented by concrete decisions. I will name some of them. First, the right of a people to return to the previous place of residence. Second, compensation for material and moral damages. And the third point, which may seem strange to you, but we residents of the Baltic republics think that the declaraiton should mention the case of the Baltic Republics, because they suffered the most substantial damages.

"The thing is that the Baltic peoples were resettled together with their territory. This has not happened to any other people. In 1940, the Stalin regime destroyed the statehood of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. In 1940 aggression was used against these republics, and they were occupied and annexed. The maintaining of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania within the composition of the Soviet Union is an illegal process. If someone speaks about the Baltic republics joining voluntary...

"[Primakov, interrupting] Excuse me please...

"[Antanyatis] I am finishing.

"[Primakov] Wait, I have to interrupt you because we are discussing a concrete issue related to the declaration. If you think that something should be added to it, you have already said this. Do not switch to another subject.

"[Antanaytis] We think that our issue is linked with the declaration. I will take no more than 2 minutes.

"[Primakov] It is not a problem of time, but of discussion of the issue.

[Antanaytis] It is a question of the essence. A perestroyka based on lies will not succeed in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. In 1940, the Soviet Union had the bloodiest regime in the world. Leaders of Communists and Baltic parties were destroyed in the union. One would ask whether normal peoples could voluntarily put their heads into a bloody noose.

"We request that the Supreme Soviet restore historical justice. For a start it is necessary, first, to accelerate the work of the commission chaired by Comrade Yakovlev for evaluating the events of 1939, i.e. the results of the Molotov pact. Today and yesterday, documents were circulated, a statement of the commission, and these documents show that the commission is working in an unsatisfactory way.

"The second point: this commission or a new one should be instructed to evaluate the events of 1940. The Supreme Soviets of Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia—I repeat, the Supreme Soviets—have already given such an evaluation in this or that form. Therefore, it is easy for the USSR Supreme Soviet to give a legal evaluation. One should analyze and sum up the conclusiosn made in the republics, whose people know and remember better than others what really happened in 1940. Finally, I will read some lines from the statement by the Commission, because not everybody seems to have received the document.

"[Primakov] Wait, it was already said yesterday that the results of the commission set up by the congress would be examined at the congress. Why are you raising now issues which have no relation to what we are discussing?

"[Antanaytis] I will explain why. The thing is that the commission was instructed to examine the events of 1939. I know that some leaders of this commission are trying to separate 1939 from the events of 1940. Those were events belonging to the same chain and they should be examined in full. Thank you."

Deputy Sakharov then supports Kugultinov in saying that rehabilitation is not the right word to use, but rather the restoration of justice. The peoples must be given compensation just as the FRG has given compensation to victims of fascism, he says. Deputy Shcherbak calls for stronger condemnation of crimes against the peoples. The people of western Ukraine and many poles also suffered deporation, he says.

At 2032 GMT Deputy Shekhovtsov calls for a decision rather than a declaration. Deputy Khallik condemns the repressions of peoples. A deputy from Kazakhstan then tells of the repression of Soviet Germans. Crimean Tatar Deputy Sefershayev recalls the deportations when he was 9 years old.

2045 GMT

LD1411221989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2045 GMT on 14 November continues its recorded relay of the 14 November USSR Supreme Soviet session at the Kremlin in Moscow.

Deputy Ignatovich relates that many Belorussians were also deported. He states that the word "genocide" is most applicable here and should be included in the declaration. The names of those responsible should no longer be honored, he concluded. Deputy Ikayev says that all peoples suffered repressions. If some peoples return to their ancestral homes, other peoples will then suffer, he notes. Deputy Ambartsumyan recalls that many Armenians were also forcibly resettled.

At 2055 GMT Deputy Bisher says that justice must be restored; if genocide was committed then those responsible must still be punished. This is greeted by applause. Estonia has adopted laws to rehabilitate people unjustly repressed, but this has fallen foul of some Soviet laws, he concludes. An unidentified woman deputy makes a proposal to erect a memorial in central Moscow to victims of Stalin.

At 2103 GMT Nishanov thanks the speakers for supporting the declaration, and says if it is adopted, specific decisions can later be adopted on the basis of it. He sums

up the various textual amendments that have been proposed. Returning peoples to their former homes would cause problems and must be examined in each case, he concludes. A questioner from the hall then asks why the word "genocide" is being avoided. Primakov says that perhaps the word does not apply here. Nishanov tells of the state of work in the commission to examine Baltic events of 1939-40.

At 2113 GMT a deputy from the hall says that genocide is applicable here. He calls for more detailed naming of those who suffered. Further specific wording proposals are made from the hall. Sakharov says that the word genocide must be included. Primakov puts the declaration to a vote. 408 present; 370 for; 5 against; 16 abstained. Obolenskiy's amendment is suggested for voting. He insists on its being put to the vote.

At 2126 GMT Deputy Burlatskiy suggests setting up a deputies' club. He says it will have a cafe.

At 2132 GMT Nishanov reads a letter from Obolenskiy protesting the lack of a vote on his amendment. Nishanov puts it to the vote. A deputy protests from the hall. It is put to the vote; 41 for; 305 against; 26 abstained.

The recorded relay concludes at 2137 GMT.

TASS Reviews 14 Nov Supreme Soviet Session

LD1411175189 Moscow TASS in English 1717 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 14 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Soviet parliament today decided to publish a bill on ownership, the principal legislative act of economic reform.

The bill aims to loosen the state's grip on property in the USSR and to create equal conditions for various forms of ownership.

Sergey Alekseyev, chairman of the Parliamentary Committee for Legislation, told parliament that the bill contains revolutionary proposals envisaging the transfer of land to farmers for lifelong hereditary ownership, guarantees of the rights of ownership, up to the lodging of claims against the state.

The deputies also decided to publish another bill, dealing with the general principles of local self-government and local economy in the USSR.

The parliament adopted a declaration recognising as unlawful and criminal all repressive acts against peoples subjected to forcible deportations during Stalin's rule, and proclaimed the unconditional restoration of their rights.

The Supreme Soviet adopted a special declaration on the occasion of the centenary of the birth of Indian national liberation leader Jawaharlal Nehru.

The declaration stated that Nehru's aspiration to endorse in international relations principles of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems fully accords with tasks of present-day international politics.

At the end of today's sitting, Moscow deputy Fedor Burlatskiy proposed setting up a club of people's deputies of the USSR where they would be able to discuss in an informal atmosphere political, legal and strategic issues that emerge in the drafting of major bills and to upgrade their professional skills as parliamentarians.

The idea was approved by the deputies.

The Supreme Soviet will continue its work on Wednesday.

Stalin's Forced Resettlement Declared Illegal

LD1411174689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1645 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 14 Nov (TASS)—A TASS parliamentary correspondent reports from the Kremlin:

The Soviet parliament today adopted a declaration stating that all repressive acts against the peoples that were subjected to forced resettlement during the period of the cult of Stalin's personality were illegal and criminal, and announced the unconditional restoration of their rights. The need for such a decision was mentioned on more than one occasion at the first Congress of People's Deputies, at the session of the Supreme Soviet, and at the CPSU Central Committee plenum on the nationalities policy, and in expressions of Soviet public opinion.

When submitting the draft declaration to deputies, Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities (one of the parliament's two chambers), stressed that the document is intended to provide a political, legal, and moral appraisal of Stalin's arbitrary rule as a crime against the Soviet peoples. The declaration will be very important for strengthening their national dignity and for restoring historical truth.

After emphasizing that during the tragic years of the Stalinist repressions, lawlessness and arbitrary rule left not a single republic and not a single people untouched, the USSR Supreme Soviet defined as "barbarous acts" the expulsion of the Kalmyks, Crimean Tatars, Germans, and Meskhetian Turks from their birthplaces, as well as the Ingushes and other peoples of the North Caucasus. It was pointed out that the policy of forced resettlement also affected the destiny of Koreans, Greeks, Kurds, and other peoples.

The Soviet parliament unconditionally condemned the forced resettlement as a most grievous crime, running counter to the nature of socialism and to the principles of democracy and legality, and declared that such practices would never be repeated in the Soviet Union.

Councils To Discuss Language, Citizenship Bills

LD1511084389 Moscow TASS in English 0748 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

In a morning sitting today chaired by Rafik Nishanov, the Soviet Parliament's Council of Nationalities is discussing bills on the free development and equal use of national languages and on the free national development of citizens of the USSR living outside their national-state entities.

At noon, the second house of the parliament, the Council of the Union, will consider amendments to the law on citizenship.

The two houses will hold a joint sitting in the afternoon to decide future proceedings involving the legislative acts discussed today.

The discussion of the bills at separate sittings of the houses aims to enhance the efficiency of parliamentary work and facilitate the fulfilment of the packed agenda at parliament's current second session.

Councils Hold Sessions 15 Nov

LD1511143889 Moscow TASS in English 1426 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Is the USSR Supreme Soviet a single-chamber parliament? This rhetorical question was asked by some deputies during the current session. Its work has hitherto proceeded only at joint meetings or in standing committees and commissions. And today the Council of the Union and the Council of Nationalities have had their separate meetings at last.

The Council of Nationalities discussed the bill on languages. It envisages the right of Union and autonomous republics to determine the status of national languages within their territories. The status of the Russian language was debated most heatedly. The bill recognises it as an instrument of national and inter-ethnic communications throughout the territory of the Union.

Boris Oleynik of the Ukraine and Andris Plotnieks of Latvia, as well as several other deputies, moved to make the wording more precise—Russian is the "official" language and the "tongue of federal communication." This, in their opinion would limit its compulsory use to questions that are within the competence of the Union.

The Council of the Union discussed the bill on Soviet citizenship. It guarantees equal rights to the citizens of all the republics, which correspond to the federal structure of the Soviet Union. At the same time, the bill confirms the right of republics to handle all questions linked with republican citizenship. Correlation of Union citizenship with that of the republics and the procedure of stripping a person of Soviet citizenship were in the spotlight of the debate.

Asked to comment on the first separate meeting of the two chambers, Yuriy Kalmykov, vice-chairman of the parliamentary legislative committee, said that he believed this new form of work was necessary. Each chamber has its own specific functions. They help to observe fully the principle of federalism and take stock of the specific interests of each nation and ethnic group.

Discussion of the submitted bills will continue this afternoon at a joint meeting of the two chambers.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Addresses Student Forum on Perestroyka

LD1511083189 Moscow TASS in English 0814 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS—Addressing a student forum which opened today in Moscow, President Mikhail Gorbachev urged Soviet young people to support perestroyka.

The future belongs to the young, and the young will benefit from the reforms, he said, speaking about the progress, tasks and prospects of perestroyka.

Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov and other senior Soviet officials are also attending the 1,658-strong five-day forum.

The meeting will discuss school reforms, social issues and students' living conditions and will submit its proposals to the Soviet Parliament and Government.

Currently, 9.4 million students study in 898 higher and 4,517 specialised secondary schools in the Soviet Union.

Stresses Socialism

LD1511150989 Moscow World Service in English 1400 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Excerpts] Soviet Leader Mikhail Gorbachev has addressed a national student congress that has opened in Moscow today. He touched on the much debated question, what should be our attitude toward the Marxist-Leninist theory, and to the ideals of the 1917 socialist revolution? He said we cannot hold the founders of that theory responsible for its subsequent distortion. Unfortunately, after Lenin's death, the consumption of socialism was inculcated which justified antidemocratic methods. But with all its deformations, Soviet people kept true to socialism. We can't deny real achievements of the past years—progress in space exploration, or a military parity with the United States. But in the period referred to now as stagnation, the Soviet Union fell behind the West in high technology. The command-administrative system was unable to provide for material, technical, and social progress.

Mikhail Gorbachev shared with the young audience his thoughts on the current aims and prospects of restructuring. He stressed that young people and no other were interested in changes, for the future belongs to them. Major economic reforms are still to come. The country is entering the second stage of its political reform, renewing the local government and the authorities in the constituent republics. Soviets, that's councils, should become genuine bodies of popular self-government.

Discusses 'New World Order,' GDR

LD1511151989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1415 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 15 Nov (TASS)—Perestroyka is a solid contribution to the progress of current civilization, stated Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, speaking today at the all-union students' forum which has opened in the Soviet capital.

Replying to student's questions, the Soviet leader stressed that, simultaneously with the reform of its society and the opening up of the socialist system's potential, the USSR offered to all peoples, within the framework of the new political thinking, the idea of building a new world order. The past stage, the "Cold War," he said, has shown the entire bankruptcy of counting on a policy of force, of the arms race and of confrontation. The problem of the survival of civilization and other global challenges, including those of ecology and the provision of information, and the scientific and technical revolution, have arisen on a practical level.

Noting that certain forces in the West are trying to interpret the profound changes in the countries of socialism as the collapse of socialist ideas, Mikhail Gorbachev stated that they want to pass off the desired for the actual. We are reforming society with due account of the new realities, we are opening up the potential of the socialist social system. We will proceed along our chosen path, remaining devoted to the ideas of socialism, the Soviet leader said.

Speaking of the reforms currently being implemented in the GDR, the Soviet leader said that they fit into the framework of the processes of renewal which have unfolded in all of the socialist countries. We welcome what is happening in the GDR, he stated.

Mikhail Gorbachev noted that the existence of two German states was the result of historical development, the real result of the World War II. This fact is commonly recognized by the world community, and one has to proceed from this reality. Today the question of the reunification of these states is not a question of contemporary politics. Calculations on this account with such a concealed meaning, he said, would be interference in the affairs of the FRG and the GDR.

Gorbachev Address Cited

LD1511140389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] As we have already reported, an all-union student forum opened in the Moscow Youth Palace today. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev gave an address. Drawing attention to the most acute problems of perestroyka, given the entire course of the country's historical development, he pointed out that in our time attempts are being made to present Leninist theory as a model of socialist development prepared in advance, whereas Lenin's works after the October period evince precisely a questing nature. The deformations of socialism during the period of Stalinism, and the system of governing the state by decree, has led to a situation where man was forgotten, as the highest value in society. And stagnation was a time of lost opportunities in scientific and technical and intellectual development. Today, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev commented, our society lacks general and political culture. Diminished attention has been given to education, too, and society is suffering great losses.

Addressing the students, Mikhail Sergeyvich Gorbachev said, in part:

[Begin Gorbachev recording] We know how concerned young people are about questions relating to social prospects and the meaning of life, the infinity of being, the internal feelings of love, good, justice, honor, and dignity of the individual. All these are intransient universal human problems and ideals, too. The man with high moral foundations will never sink to civic irresponsibility, nationalism, chauvinism, or trampling on the rights of other people. The genuinely cultured and educated [intelligentnyy] man is first and foremost a citizen, a patriot, and internationalist. Lively discussion is currently underway among students about the place of the humanities in the educational process. Various opinions are being expressed about further improving the study of Marxist-Leninist theory. The practical measures, of which you are aware, have been adopted, taking account of this. This problem will be discussed at the forum. I should like to wish that your discussions on this topic, this fundamental topic, may be constructive and fruitful. Neglect of theory and of broad, humanitarian culture costs dear, as we now know from our own experience.

I cannot fail to touch on matters relating to the material basis, scientific and technical equipment, and solution of the social problems of collectives of higher educational institutions [VUZ]. We do indeed understand the importance and acuteness of these problems. Furthermore, in spite of all the difficulty and strains in the financial and social spheres, we have implemented a number of specific steps in this direction: As you know, the size of stipends for some categories of students have been increased, as have the salaries of VUZ teaching staff and the wages of young specialists.

These are but the first steps. In accordance with instructions, the State Planning Committee [Gosplan] and the appropriate departments are drawing up proposals to improve the material situation of students, including a general increase in the size of stipends. We take it as our point of departure that despite all financial difficulties, we must find funds to implement such measures, starting in 1991, and to lay them down in the 13th 5-year plan. [applause]

The development of contractual relations between VUZ's and enterprises will facilitate the solution not only of social issues, but also of matters relating to creating a modern, scientific, and technical base for teaching.

What is of course involved is the equipping of VUZ's with new technology, but above all the utilization, under appropriate conditions, of the base of scientific and production organizations. We do have such experience in the country; it is necessary to move even more resolutely along the path of integrating VUZ's, science, and production.

We all know, of course, that the student years involve not only study and science, but also a full social life that becomes more intensive every year. The party is in favor of the full involvement of young people in all the social processes. It is quite obvious that young people have their own specific interests, and must strive to implement these interests by themselves, by participating in the political process, without interpreters, and by increasing their contribution to the transformation of society. I note with satisfaction that the student fraternity is trying to act in precisely this way, and indeed I think it was because the students have something to say to the party, the Supreme Soviet, the government, and the whole of society, that the forum opened today.

The organized student movement is gathering force today. The whole of geography is represented in the numerous student councils, societies of people from the same region, and public formation sharing a professional or cultural interest. However, do all the new organizational structures serve to improve matters? do they correspond with the increased need and aspriation of students to find themselves not only in professional but also sociopolitical activity? I think that we must guard ourselves against the danger of dividing up and proliferating into groups and clubs, and of losing our image as a powerful force in our society and an educated, energetic force. I think that you need to discuss this and think about it.

One of the problems that is now being discussed is the issue of the formation of an all-union student body. Should it be created or not? Well, all in all it is for you, comrades, to decide whether to create it or not. The main thing is to direct one's efforts into the channel of socially useful matters, for the benefit of perestroyka. The party is in favor of broad participation by all young people, and of course students, in the composition of soviets at all levels; of the creation of real opportunities for political growth of young people; and of their promotion to responsible posts in the apparatus. [applause]

But comrades, under the conditions of democracy this is not now just handed to you on a plate. But you, let me tell you frankly, you slept through the elections of the people's deputies of the USSR. I think you have now woken up thoroughly, and won't allow yourselves to be left to one side at the next stage of political reforms. [applause]

In our conversation we cannot fail to touch on the situation in the Komsomol. There are now heated discussions going on in this very large political youth organization about what the Komsomol is to be like in our time. For me the answer to the main question first of all is perfectly clear: Is the Komsomol to exist or not? Certainly it must exist. [applause] And perestroyka gives the Komsomol the chance to determine its role in society and the state better, and to revive its creative search and initiative. The main force for the renewal of the Komosomol is the Komsomol members themselves. Here it is important to tackle the business in a real way, getting rid of formalism and the show that everyone is fed up with, getting rid of everything that fetters the initiative and energy of young people, and hinders the implementation of their stands as citizens, their participation in society's affairs.

I think that now, when the country is at a stage of a historical breakthrough, when the fate of our society is being decided for many decades ahead, the Komsomol should find its place as a political organization for young people. The cause of perestroyka needs the energy of the young. We are certain that the Komsomol will sort out the most important problems, and will take the correct decisions at its congress. I can say only one thing: We shall be at your side in this responsible time as well. [applause]

We note with satisfaction that during the revolutionary years of perestroyka Soviet young people are warmly supporting the policy of the party of a socialist renewal of society. I wish your forum great success. [applause] [end recording]

Vorkuta Strike Affects Cherepovets Plant

LD1411212189 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] The lengthy strike of mineworkers in the Vorkuta coalmining area in the north of Russia has complicated the work of the Cherepovets smelting plant which is one of the largest in the USSR. Because of the shortages of coal supplied largely from Vorkuta, production processes at the plant have slowed down. Workers' earnings have decreased. Their negotiations with the strikers have yielded no results so far. The strikers have no intention of resuming coalmining before 17th November, the day

when their representatives meet with government officials in Moscow. Trains with coal from other coalmining areas have been dispatched to the plant in Cherepovets.

Striking Vorkuta Miners Submit Demands

LD1411214589 Moscow TASS in English 2137 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] Vorkuta, Komi Autonomous Republic, the north of Russia November 15 TASS—The Vorkuta miners who have been on strike for many days have put forth a package of demands to the government.

The package comprises five points, TASS was told at the Vorkuta city workers' (strike) committee. These points include the demand to repeal the rules of discipline for workers operating in the specially hazardous underground conditions, to ensure that a worker transferred to another enterprise retains extra payment, in addition to standard wages, for work in the Arctic region, to secure full and immediate extra (Arctic) payment to young men and women from the moment of employment and to introduce different additions to wages in accordance with the length of service to those who have lived in the Arctic region five years and more.

The package also includes the demand to endorse the status of the workers' (strike) committee as a standing body endowed with special powers and to punish those guilty of disrupting the implementation of a number of provisions contained in government resolution 608.

The city strike committee has stated that the striking miners will only resume work after these demands are met. "The miners will strike until it happens," committee co-chairman V. Kopasov told TASS.

The package will be taken to Moscow by a group of miners who will participate in the consideration of tbe way government resolution 608 is being implemented in the office of Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov.

Another group of Vorkuta miners' representatives has left for Moscow to attend a session of the USSR Supreme Court that will consider the plea of the Vorkuta strike committees to repeal the ruling of the Supreme Court of the Komi Autonomous Republic that declared the strike at a number of mines of the Vorkutaugol association unlawful.

On November 11, the government repealed the old disciplinary rules for work in specially hazardous underground conditions, a Ministry of the Coal Industry spokesman told TASS. The Vorkuta miners have also been informed of the decision.

Losses resulting from the current strike have reached enormous proportions. The Vorkutaugol association has produced 435,000 tonnes less coal since the beginning of November than planned.

The shipment of coal to consumers outside Vorkuta is behind schedule—the delayed shipments amount to 535,000 tonnes of coal.

Miners Reportedly Want To Submit Case to ILO

AU1511121189 Paris AFP in English 1147 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, Nov 15 (AFP)—Leaders of some 15,000 Soviet coal miners on strike at Vorkuta in the Russian Arctic hinted Wednesday that they may take their case to the International Labour Organisation in Geneva after a Soviet court on Tuesday upheld a ruling that their strike was "illegal".

A member of the Vorkuta strike committee, contacted Wednesday by telephone, said the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation had refused to overturn a ruling by the Supreme Court of the Komi Autonomous Republic which pronounced the three-week-old stoppage to be illegal.

The spokesman said the strike committee considered a new appeal to the Soviet Supreme Court in Mosow to be "useless" and instead was considering asking the ILO to take up the miners' grievances.

A miners' delegation is now in Moscow in the hope of meeting Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov to discuss their demands.

The miners say the authorities have failed to respect earlier agreements on pay, bonuses and improvements to the harsh living conditions at Vorkuta which lies north of the Arctic Circle.

The miners have also made political demands, including the abolition of Article 6 of the Soviet Constitution on the dominant role of the Communist Party.

According to TASS news agency, the strike has resulted in a loss of 535,000 tonnes of coal.

In an interview with the weekly Literary Gazette, the deputy public prosecutor of Russia, Alexey Buturlin criticised the Soviet Minister of Coal Mining, Mikhail Shchadov for failing to ensure that agreements with the miners were respected.

The magistrate said Mr. Shchadov had "failed to grasp the new tasks required of him."

He said the "coal mining bureaucracy" bore a large share of responsibility in the Vorkuta conflict, adding that many of the miners' demands should have been satisfied long ago.

Miners' Situation in Donbass Reported

LD1411232489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 14 Nov 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; G. Kondavrov reports from Donbass]

[Excerpts] [G. Kondaurov] Today the railway men have fully fulfilled the Donetsk coal basin mines quota for empty rail cars, but hundreds of rail cars will not be loaded. And the picture is the same every day. Since the beginning of the month, the plan for loading Donbass coal for electric power stations, coking and chemical plants, and heating towns and villages has been underfulfilled by more than 500,000 tonnes. The miners' debt to the country is increasing. Half of the mines today are not coping with the plan for the extraction of fuel. Why, until the present, have the Donbass miners been completely unable to restore the working rhythm that existed before the June strikes? We talked about this with members of the working collective's soviet and of the strike committee of the Mateyevka mine. [video shows views of pits, empty railcars, miners filing along, and a group of men in a room being interviewed]

[First unidentified man] First of all, I would like to say that there has not been a lessening of discipline. Compared with the past periods, there have not been more absences from work. No one is handing in notices. It is quite the opposite. There has been flood of cadres to us here in the mines. But when it comes to supplies of machines and equipment, in general, this has decreased by 50 percent. You see, compared with last year, deliveries of pit props have been so short that we have nothing to prop up the long faces.

[Second unidentified man] Our long face is worked manually. We literally have to buy picks for bottles [of alcohol], (pipes) and hammers as well. In the opinion of the working people this long face could have been equipped with a modern complex. There is nothing out of the ordinary there for coal extraction, but we did not get a complex. And people are suffering because of it.

[Third unidentified man] There are all kinds of possible bonuses that we allot in order to make it possible for us to work in the future. [passage omitted]

[First man] Now winter is already starting and we will gain nothing by striking. We will only make the situation worse.

[Fourth unidentified man] This is why we consider it impermissible to put forward new demands in the course of the strike which is now taking place in Vorkuta. This is the stand being taken by our strike committee.

Further on Estonian Supreme Soviet Session

Resolution on 1940 Events

PM1511140189 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 15 Nov 89 p 1

[Own correspondent G. Sapozhnikova report: "Slamming the Door at the Session—Action or Gesture?"]

[Text] Tallinn—It has been quite a rarity over the past year for Estonian parliament deputies to adopt a resolution unanimously, irrespective of nationality. Some attempts to work out a mechanism for taking account of minority opinions were made, but... on Sunday, one of the working days of the 13th session of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet, 11th Convocation, the "For Equal Rights" deputies' group refused to take part in the session and walked out of the auditorium.

It is said that this is by no means unusual in world parliamentary practice and that the rest of the world treats such things far more calmly than we do. Well, our concern is also justified: This incident will in no way promote the stabilization of relations in the republic—after all, there are specific forces backing those who left the auditorium and those who stayed behind.

There was a foretaste of this incident on the 1st day of the latest stage of the session, when the deputies discussed the Law on Elections to the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet. And once again there were clashes about the residence qualification—just as there had been during the adoption of the Law on Elections to Local Soviets (remember the wave of summer strikes in Tallinn?). Compared with the new proposals on a 15-year qualification, the old proposals for compulsory 5 years' residence in the republic no longer seem serious. The "For Equal Rights" deputies' group, comprising representatives of the Russian-speaking population, pressed for a third reading of the draft law. But, clearly, it is not yet fated to be read and adopted. Because there was one other question on the session agenda: discussion of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium commission's conclusions on the elaboration of a historical and legal assessment of the events of 1940.

... All the deputies received thick packets of materials. These contained eyewitness testimonies, copies of documents, loads of newspaper reports from the past, and the social memory of the people—which cannot be suppressed, however hard you may try. When the people's memory differs from the official interpretation of events, tensions arise. Social tensions in society and national tensions in national republics. Nobody needs the tension in Estonia about the prospects for its economic independence. Nonetheless, these questions are arising right now—after all, without the whole truth about the past there can be no faith in the future. But it is a question not just of the truth itself but of the conclusions drawn by the republic commission and the resolution text, which are to be recognized by the deputies. The latter is exceedingly important, and therefore I will permit myself to cite a long passage:

"The Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet, on the basis of the commission's decisions and conclusions on the elaboration of a historical and legal assessment of the events of 1940 in Estonia set up by the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium ... concludes that Estonia's inclusion in the Soviet Union in 1940 was ultra vires [ne bylo pravomochnym].

"On the basis of the above and relying on the repeatedly expressed will of the people to restore Estonia's state sovereignty by parliamentary means, the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

"1. To deem the Estonian State Duma's 22 July 1940 decision—the 'Declaration on the Entry of Estonia Into the USSR'—to be legally null and void since it was not based on the Estonian people's freely expressed will.

"2. To petition for Estonia to be restored as a subject of international law, to which end the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet reserves the right to organize negotiations on relations within the union of sovereign Soviet states and the international community...."

Jumping ahead, I will say that it was precisely this text—the resolution text—that was adopted, despite vigorous protests from the Russian-speaking deputies, who saw the conclusions not so much as a historical and legal assessment of events as a program of action for the future. additionally, there is complete confusion about the present: It turns out that, de jure, the republic is not part of the USSR, but de facto it is. Absurd!

What about the future? That was the question asked by everyone in the auditorium and everyone who listened to the radio broadcast. On the one hand, the historical and legal assessment commission did not set itself the task of deciding the future fate of the republic, all the more so as it is the people rather than the Supreme Soviet that enjoys the constitutional right to secede from the USSR. On the other hand, ideas about restoring Estonia as a subject of international law—involving ideas of a union treaty, special status for the republic, or the status of an independent [sobstvennyy] state—were raised very unambiguously in certain speeches at the session. But if questions of such a serious nature are being decided, this means that the other interested party—the Soviet Government—must be involved in the discussion. This was the opinion of the members of the "For Equal Rights" deputies' group, which pointed out the controversial selection of sources and research materials made by the commission for the historical and legal assessment of events. We will have to wait for decisions from the Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

... Quite honestly, one way or another it was uncomfortable being in the auditorium—both when certain deputies accused others of ignorance on questions of Estonian history and mentioned the people's right to self-determination at every opportunity, and when others tried to persuade the former that relations with the Soviet Union should be severed (although, to be objective, the question was not raised in this fashion—it was merely a question of **annulling** the "Declaration on the Entry of Estonia Into the USSR"). And it was also very uncomfortable when Pavel Panfilov, chairman of the "For Equal Rights" deputies' group, read aloud the statement and 56 people made a great show of walking out.

As a result a very substantive addition to the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet resolution was adopted without the participation of the deputies' group (for the sake of objectivity I would add that some Russian-speaking deputies did remain in the auditorium). this resolution's adoption is not to be interpreted as an application of Article 69 of the Estonian SSR Constitution (On the Republic's Right To Secede From the USSR).

We do not yet know what attitude Estonian social movements will take in this conflict among their deputies. But one thing is clear: There are points to be considered both by those who walked out and by those who stayed behind—after all, if protests by ethnic minorities are repeated from sitting to sitting, and if these protests are ignored with enviable regularity, can we talk about democratization? According to Arnold Ryuytel, the republic's president, the duty of resolving this situation and organizing negotiations with the deputies' group will be shouldered by the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Election Law Debate

PM1411143189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent L. Levitskiy report under the rubric "Union Republic Supreme Soviet Sessions": "Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic"]

[Text] After a 1-month recess the 13th session of the Estonian Supreme Soviet has resumed its work. A large number of pickets were waiting for the deputies at the Political Education House from early morning. The republic's parliamentarians were to adopt decisions which would largely determine the future. Specifically, they were to approve laws on the basic guidelines for local self-management and elections to the Supreme Soviet, make a historical and legal assessment of the events of 1940, discuss the first reading of draft laws on prices, the budget, and enterprises, introduce an amendment to the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Constitution....

The adoption of the Law on Local Self-Management was somewhat delayed: The mechanism for the introduction of amendments has not yet been fully worked out, and the vote count takes a long time. This will soon be taken care of by electronic equipment which is being installed in the Supreme Soviet's session hall. But what is to be done about the heat of the passions which are increasingly being displayed in the parliament? Furthermore, in accordance with the new Supreme Soviet standing orders, deputies' groups have been established in parliament. Two of them—"Democratic Development" and "For Equal Rights"—predetermined the acrimoniousness of the debate on the Law on Elections to the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet. Or, more accurately, around the residence qualifications. The original draft provided for universal suffrage from the age of 18, and the right to be elected for people who had lived in Estonia during the previous 5 years. This stipulation was

subsequently stiffened to 10 years. The "Democratic Development" group proposed that residence qualifications be introduced for voters too and that they be increased in respect of candidate deputies.

"We have not revoked the residence qualifications in the Law on Elections to Local Soviets. Why should we renounce them in respect of elections to the Supreme Soviet?" Deputy Yu. Uluots argued.

V. Koltakov, a "Dvigatel" Plant worker, took exception to this. He is a member of the "For Equal Rights" group. Its chairman, P. Panfilov, second secretary of the Tallinn Estonian Communist Party City Committee [gorkom], persistently urged lawmakers to renounce the idea of residence qualifications.

A 15-year residence qualification for both voters and candidate deputies was backed by E. Savisaar, chairman of the State Planning Committee [Gosplan] and deputy chairman of the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers. In his opinion servicemen should also be barred from taking part in elections.

"They are proposing to bar hundreds of thousands of people from taking part in elections and they describe this as democracy," A. Lukoshkin, chief of the merchant port, gave vent to his puzzlement.

On behalf of the "For Equal Rights" group N. Ivanov, deputy chief of the Estonian Shipping Line, proposed that the vote on the draft law on elections to the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet be postponed, amendments ensuing from the debate be introduced, and the law submitted for a third reading. The new republic Supreme Soviet standing orders make provision for this type of discussion of draft laws.

The session proceedings were suspended for a day. They will resume Sunday 12 November.

ETA Protests Supreme Soviet Report

LD1511000189 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1800 GMT 13 Nov 89

[Statement of the Estonian Telegraph Agency—read by announcer]

[Text] The ESTONIAN TELEGRAPH AGENCY, ETA, announces that the information published in PRAVDA of 14 November, and broadcast on 13 November on the Vremya program about the 13th session of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet on Sunday does not correspond with the material sent to TASS by ETA. Information about the historical and legal assessment of the events which took place in Estonia in 1940 which was provided at the session has been completely omitted. Hence also the heading of the report which appeared is not appropriate, because there was no discussion about Article 6 of the Estonian SSR Constitution taking place. Proceeding from the above, the Estonian Telegraph Agency relinquishes authorship of the material issued by TASS. ETA has expressed its protest to TASS in respect of the present matter.

Latvian Supreme Soviet Session Resumes 10 Nov

Picketing Reported

PM1411144189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report under the general heading: "At Republic Supreme Soviet Sessions"]

[Text] Riga, 10 Nov—Pickets greeting Latvian deputies before the start of a session have already become a common phenomenon. And the familiar picture was repeated today, when the session of the republic Supreme Soviet continued its sittings after a break of almost 1 month. The substance of the posters could have been predicted in advance. Questions of military service for Latvia's citizens and of instituting the post of president have been debated for several weeks now in Latvia. Some of the viewpoints—and there is a very wide range of them—were graphically reflected in the string of slogans.

At the morning sitting the deputies returned to the question of the rights with which the supreme organ of state power in the republic should be endowed. The path to today's final decision had lasted 3 months. During that time a version of direct elections to the Congress of People's Deputies was examined, but the majority voted for the Supreme Soviet, without the Congress. It was at the end of the past debate that a proposal was added to elect a president, which had a substantial influence on the powers of the supreme organ of power. A break was taken to ponder the decision, and now a common agreement had to be reached.

The session summed up the results of the public discussion of the draft laws and analyzed opinions on the president's status. On the one hand, his election in a direct general election was recognized as testifying in favor of democracy. Such a step will help to strengthen the republic's sovereignty and to enhance its international prestige. On the other hand, it was stated at the session, the extensive functions envisaged for the president give great individual power and could lead to a restriction of the Supreme Soviet's activity. There is no mechanism that would prevent manifestations of authoritarianism, nor is there confidence that the innovation will improve the complex situation in the republic or result in the consolidation of its inhabitants. It was therefore decided to be in no hurry over introducing the institution of president.

The question of qualifications was once again put to the vote. The previously adopted norm remained in force—a candidate local soviet deputy must have lived in Latvia for the past 5 years, and a candidate Supreme Soviet deputy for 10 years.

A sharp debate developed over the draft budget and plan for the republic's economic and social development for next year and the progress in fulfilling this year's plan. It was emphasized at the session that the republic is switching to new principles of management as of 1990—to work under conditions of economic independence. This imposes special responsibility. The permanent commissions' coreport stated, however, that, despite repeated preliminary analysis of the draft plan and budget, it has not been possible to achieve a substantial change in the practice of planning and funding.

The deputies' speeches revealed concern that the state of affairs in the supply of food and goods to the population is not improving. Visiting cards have not justified the hopes pinned on them. Criticism was leveled at the situation in the construction complex, where a number of targets for construction of projects in the social sphere have not been met. Note was taken of the growth in prices and the increase in the number of scarce goods. It was emphasized at the session that the social thrust of the plan under discussion is still barely apparent. The "Housing-90" program is, in practice, under threat of failure in many cities and rayons in the republic. The deputies demanded that the government take more radical measures to improve the economy and raise people's living standards.

The session, whose agenda includes 16 items, is continuing its work.

Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact Assessed

LD1411145489 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 2105 GMT 12 Nov 89

[Text] [Announcer] A report of the Supreme Soviet's commission which examined the assessment of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact concluded on 23 August 1939 and its consequences for the fate of Latvia was included in the agenda of the [Latvian Supreme Soviet] session. A report on the conclusions of the commission was delivered by deputy Ivars Kezbers, secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee. In the Dzintarkrasts [Amber Coast] we include a part of the delivered items of the conclusions, in which the consequences of this pact appear in the events of the summer of 1940 in Latvia.

[Begin Kezbers recording] In the election platform of the deputies of the Working People's of Latvia Bloc which promised the voters democratic freedoms, social progress, and Latvian independence, an opportunity for the Saeima [parliament] to proclaim Soviet power and for Latvia to join the composition of the USSR was not mentioned. Thereby the deputies of the Working People's of Latvia Bloc had neither moral and political right nor the authority of the voters already at the first session to decide upon the question on changing the system of the State of Latvia and the state's legal status. The decision of the Saeima on the change of the character of the power was not confirmed in principle either by questioning the inhabitants or by a referendum as was required by the Constitution of 1922 of the Republic of Latvia.

The declaration on Latvia joining the composition of the USSR was proclaimed by the Saeima which did not possess the appropriate constitutional authority for doing this. This act was adopted for achieving the great-power goals of Stalinism, disregarding the will of the citizens of Latvia. This was confirmed even before the USSR Supreme Soviet session, which confirmed the annexation and incorporation of Latvia, by Molotov who announced that in such a manner the USSR was recovering territories which belonged to it already for a long time.

From the standpoint of the legislation of the Republic of Latvia and of the generally-accepted norms of international law, and juridical consequences of the activity of the illegally elected Saeima, including its decision on the change of the state system, has been qualified by the commission as against the law from the very beginning, and regards the declaration adopted on 21 july 1940 by the People's Saeima on Latvia joining the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as illegal from the moment of adoption.

Implementation of the secret agreements concluded in 1939-40 between the USSR and Germany was an international crime, but the introduction of state terror in Latvia against the Latvian people and other peoples of Latvia was a crime against humanity.

Evaluating the tragic events of the past, a condemnation without compromise of the Stalinist policy of seizing Latvia and the entire Baltic region is an absolutely necessary precondition in order to normalize international relations and develop the equal rights of republics which have common goals and complete freedom of choosing their road. [end recording]

[Announcer] A debate also took place on this Supreme Soviet commission's work assessment and results. In this USSR People's Deputy Mavriks Vulfsons expressed his opinion.

[Begin Vulfsons recording] Psychologically, and I partially think also politically with this announcement, we are taking by all means an important, great, serious and considered step not only in Latvia's economic and political sovereignty, but also in the restoration of future independence of Latvia.

That is how this is being assessed in Moscow; that is how this is also being assessed by our people here in Latvia.

The question has all the more that kind of a shade because we live in an entirely singular era. Since the first days when we began to talk about this problem, when we brought up the question of our illegal birth and even more of the illegal baptism, since that time many events have made us think about how one after another, the artificial pseudo-socialist regimes, created by brutal

force and as a result of World War II, are crumbling. We see how this has happened in Poland, how this has happened in Hungary—we see this today in the GDR. I think the hour is not far off when we shall see this also in some other socialist countries in Eastern Europe. [end recording]

On Marking Independence Day

LD1411143689 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 2105 GMT 12 Nov 89

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] The question of the opportunities for an alternative service in the territory of Latvia for those men to be called up who for religious or other reasons do not wish to serve the compulsory military service has attracted the increased attention of Latvian society in recent months. At the [Latvian Supreme Soviet] session deputies noted the significance of this question, but at the present moment draft laws have not been drawn up with which the choice of this autumn's men to be called up could be influenced. The session charged a special commission with the task of continuing with the work on the draft law on alternative service and adopted a special resolution on a complex of undertakings in the course of which the army's activity must be subjected to stricter control. At the present moment the necessity of establishing an alternative service is determined by the corrections which have been made to the Latvian SSR Constitution.

We include in the Dzintarkrasts [Amber Coast, name of program] an excerpt of the speech by the poet and deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet Janis Peters.

[Begin Peters recording] I think that we have not dialectically explained in the press to the people either the February revolution [in 1917] or the events of 7 and 8 November which we will call the October Socialist Revolution. And Margaret Thatcher, who loudly and clearly announced, has considerably overtaken us—we may not agree with that: I, however, agree with that—who said: what happened in 1917 in Russia was an overthrow [apversums], what happens at present in Eastern Europe and in Russia, in other words in the Soviet Union, is a real revolution.

If we had told this to our people then the 7 and 8 November festivities would have proceeded under another key this year.

I think we must all be worthy of this revolution the like of which is taking place at present in the socialist countries of Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union which, after all, is the inspirer of these processes, in the best meaning. So I appeal for us to be worthy of the revolution, and for the date of 18 November, too, to be included into the calendar of this revolution as an organic, natural component part of this revolution, because only by the revolution, after all, after 700 years of slavery in Latvia, was Latvia able to poroclaim itself an independent state on 18 November [1918]. [end recording]

Latvian Interior Minister Interviewed

PM1411105789 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 10 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Interview with Lieutenant General B.Ya. Shteynbrik, Latvian minister of internal affairs, by K. Markaryan under rubric "Today Is Soviet Militia Day: We Can Only Dream About Calm"—first paragraph is introduction; place and date of interview not given]

[Text] What worries the personnel of Latvia's internal affairs organs today? On the eve of Militia Day, I talked about this with Lieutenant General B.Ya. Shteynbrik, the republic's minister of internal affairs.

[Markaryan] Bruno Yakovlevich, I recall how even 2 years ago, when mass demonstrations and meetings were a novelty in Riga, the militia systematically was used extremely widely. On 18 November 1987, when the establishment of Latvia's independence was celebrated, the city center was surrounded by large militia details. I couldn't get through the cordon even with a press card. Now, you won't encounter such things. But a special militia detachment has been set up under the Ministry of Internal Affairs in the city....

[Shteynbrik] Alas, when those whose duty it is cannot cope with the work, it is necessary to resort to extreme measures, using the militia in a role which does not properly belong to it. But this year, for example, when the human chain stretched through Latvia on 23 August, only 1,500 militiamen were used to ensure order, most of them State Motor Vehicle Inspection Administration personnel who escorted the columns and controlled the traffic. The militia now is not used en masse as it was before. A detail of a few of our personnel is usually present at various rallies.

The special militia detachment, which includes young men who know unarmed combat and karate techniques, is another matter. They are meant first and foremost to look after people's safety in extreme situations, when various excesses are possible. Usually, the special militia detachment performs patrol duty, particularly in Riga's central rayon—Kirovskiy Rayon—and participates in detaining dangerous criminals and racketeers.

[Markaryan] I have heard that a new form of murder has appeared—contract killing and the price of this "service" sometimes is as little as R1,000. Is that so?

[Shteynbrik] We do not have such a problem. We have declared war on organized crime. Since the beginning of the year, 11 criminal groups involved in fraud and extortion and possessing firearms already have been arrested. At the present time, criminal proceedings have been or are being instituted against 94 people.

The main type of crime is theft, misappropriation of state property, and speculation. Because it is very difficult now to buy liquor during the day in Riga, nocturnal dealers have appeared in great numbers.

Now we often go on about society's humanization and we describe criminals' misfortunes and the hardships of prison life. Court and prosecutor's office personnel have started in many cases to play safe, showing indulgence to lawbreakers. But, unfortunately, more often we forget about humaneness regarding those who have served their time and are going home. A few figures: In the 9 months since the beginning of the year, 2,300 people were released from [correctional labor] colonies, but only 1,800 were given residence permits and and even fewer have been given jobs. The following is also worrying: Almost one in three crimes is committed by minors. The reason for this, I think, is that many teenagers who leave school after eighth grade effectively have no job, since it is virtually impossible for 15-16-year-olds to get work.

[Markaryan] In connection with everything that has been said, we can only be surprised that crime is rising and criminals are being supplied with modern equipment, yet the militia's problems, it seems, continue to be its problems alone.

[Shteynbrik] A lot is being said now about how the militia is unprotected. I would put it another way: The militia is tired. Tired first and foremost from psychological pressure. Yes, very many people from outside the republic work here, and Latvians make up only 30 percent of the militia. Here our worker who is not an indigenous inhabitant of the republic frequently takes on the role of an undesirable "migrant." On account of this, many quite good specialists are leaving for other republics or are giving up their work in the organs. Of course, poor material provision is also having an effect. Yet nearby, as an example, there are flourishing cooperatives. Incidentally, there are now two so-called detective cooperatives operating in Riga, where former employees of ours also work, many of them after being dismissed from the militia ranks because they were unsuited to the job or had compromised themselves. It is surprising, but in some instances they are almost presuming to replace the official internal affairs organs. It would be all right if they gave juridical consultations or guarded some facilities. But I am sure that they are simply not competent to deal with operational-investigative work. Private detectives' activity is not subject to any supervision. This question, I think, must be seriously examined. At any rate, the example of an unscrupulous worker being dismissed and then finding some comfortable sinecure has a far from positive effect on specialists continuing to work in the militia on their previous salary.

[Markaryan] What are you yourselves doing to change the existing situation?

[Shteynbrik] Without waiting for changes on an all-union scale, this year, thanks to assistance from the republic's Council of Ministers, we have begun to make an additional payment of up to R50 to the entire NCO personnel. Some rayon authorities are finding funds to encourage the officer personnel as well. In the near future, questions of improving their working conditions will also be examined.

One more point: Of course, the militiaman must analyze events in the republic and be able to make himself understood both in Russian and Latvian. So we are devoting a lot of attention to training local cadres. For example, we are concluding an agreement with seniors at Latvia University's law faculty, paying them R80 in addition to their stipend, and we are preparing them for work in the organs. We are also accepting youths of draft age for the Riga higher militia school.

[Markaryan] Thank you for talking to me. Congratulations on Militia Day.

Lithuanian Party Leaders 'Summoned' to Moscow

LD1511110789 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 13 Nov 89

[Text] Unconfirmed reports say that a group of the Lithuanian Communist Party leaders have been summoned to Moscow. It is very probable that this week a Politburo sitting will discuss the matters of the Lithuanian Communist Party.

As is known, the congress of Lithuanian Communists, due to be held on 19 December, is to endorse an independent party program and rules. It is something that not a single Union Communist Party has ventured so far. The program outline of the Lithuanian Communist Party provides that in its relations with the main Soviet Party, subordination will eventually be transformed into equal cooperation.

The Central Committee plenum which set the congress date and approved the agenda was held a month ago, and until recently there have been no repercussions from Moscow. We are likely to hear them this week.

Sajudis Reports 10 Nov Riot, Curfew in Kishinev

LD1411211889 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0800 GMT 13 Nov 89

[Text] The Sajudis information agency reports:

Kishinev: On 10 November a picket was staged outside the building of the Moldavian Interior Ministry [MVD]. A group of young men declared that they refused to do their military service in the Soviet army. They also urged the setting up of a national militia.

Five minutes later the young men were arrested. Several passers-by who wanted to free those arrested were beaten up. Those who tried to escape by running away were chased in trams. They were kicked. People were trying to defend themselves by throwing stones at the militia. The militiamen responded to this by shooting and throwing tear gas. A large amount of gas [words indistinct] was used. When the militiamen retreated to the Interior Ministry building, the enraged crowd threw stones and rags soaked in gasoline at the MVD building.

According to reports in the official press, 83 militia men and 46 civilians were injured: 30 people were arrested. According to the National Front, several hundred people were injured and arrested.

The Moldavian People's Front demands the resignation of Grossu, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, and Kalin, chairman of the Council of Ministers. The Moldavian People's Front and the USSR people's deputies Leonid [name indistinct] and Grigoriy Viyeru were blamed for the incident by the Moldavian government. A curfew has been imposed in the republic. Adults are permitted to stay out until 2100; restaurants and shops are closed from 1600. Shops selling alcohol are closed. Roads and access roads to the capital are guarded by the MVD troops.

According to the information given by the members of the Moldavian People's Front, about 15,000 soldiers have recently been sent in to the suburbs of Kishinev as well as [number indistinct] of internal troops, armored cars, and aircraft. [passage indistinct]

Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Session Reported

PM1411125789 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 89 p 1

["Our Correspondent" V. Zarovskiy report: "Law on Citizenship: 'Zero' Option"]

[Text] Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]—Several important documents were examined at the 14th session of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet in Vilnius, but, of course, the main one was the Law on Citizenship. The disputes over this law have been under way for almost 1 year. Is it necessary and who has the right to citizenship? The most contradictory opinions have been voiced. Many people fought for a residence qualification. The deputies did not adopt a draft law at the 13th session. Some wordings in the document lacked cogency and justification. The finished draft was published in the press once more. By and large the public expressed approval of it and this was also shown by the course of the session.

Deputies voted for the "zero option," that is, those people who live on Lithuania's territory and have a permanent place of residence here or a "permanent legal source of subsistence" are deemed to be citizens of the republic.

There were heated disputes about the correlation between citizenship of the Lithuanian SSR and union citizenship. The session ultimately decided that "at a time when Lithuania has still not acquired full state sovereignty, citizens of the Lithuanian SSR also enjoy the rights of citizens of the USSR."

What about duties? Unfortunately, the law does not mention this at all directly.

The original proposal regarding an oath of loyalty to the republic provoked considerable criticism. It is, perhaps, necessary, said the deputies, voicing their doubts, but a mass oath would introduce an element of theatricality and would degrade national feelings. They decided to leave it as a condition when granting citizenship by "naturalization." Obviously, not a very apt term. It means the following: Newcomers to Lithuania must spend 10 years there, only then can they claim citizenship.

Thus, the law has resolved the complex question for the Baltic—you only have to recall Estonia—of who can take part in elections and referendums (a law on which was also adopted at this session). All citizens of the republic can take part.

Lithuanian Communist Party Draft Program Cited

LD1411101389 Moscow TASS in English 0720 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] Vilnius November 14—By ELTA correspondent Arturas Mankiavicius:

Practically no one in Lithuania is indifferent to the future of the Communist Party. Not only communists but also many non-party people believe that the Latvian [as received] Communist Party (LCP) is the real force to lead perestroyka.

Discussion within the party and about the party became particularly keen when it was announced that the LCP's 20th congress would be held on December 19 this year (earlier than usual).

Most participants in the discussion spoke of the need for a radical restructuring of the LCP.

Draft fundamentals of a Lithuanian Communist Party programme, prepared by a working group under the LCP Central Committee, and a draft programme of the LCP, prepared by the joint collective of representatives of the republican Academy of Sciences, Vilnius University, and the party organisations of Lithuanian creative unions, were made public at the end of September.

However, it would be wrong to regard the drafts as alternative: they have much in common.

The draft fundamentals, for example, formulate the party's strategic goal as follows: "To build a democratic socialist society in Lithuania in which basic humanistic aspirations—the freedom of the individual and social justice—would be exercised to the utmost. This goal, the authors believe, can be achieved only through the establishment of a sovereign Lithuanian state".

The draft programme says: "The Lithuanian Communist Party proclaims it as its main goal to create an independent, democratic, rule-of-law, and socialist Lithuanian state. The principal values of it will be the human being, humanism, freedom, democracy, social justice, and the working people's well-being."

A draft statute of the Lithuanian Communist Party was published recently. It is the result of the joint work of all the above-mentioned groups.

Opinions expressed by the public were taken into consideration during the drafting of the statute.

It can be said that the draft statute most clearly reflects the expectations of a majority of Lithuanian people.

It emphasises, in particular, that the LCP is an independent political organisation.

The draft statute is accompanied with a commentary which says that the realisation and assertion of independence is a complex process the duration of which will depend on the course of perestroyka in the Soviet Union, on political, economic conditions in and around the republic, on the determination and consistency of efforts of all people to revive national statehood and on their trust in the LCP.

The proclamation of an independent Lithuanian Communist Party signifies not a break off of relations with the CPSU but their development, the commentary says.

Lithuania To Operate First Youth Radio Station

LD1311145289 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 11 Nov 89

[Text] Towards the end of the year a nongovernmental youth radio station M1, the first of its kind in the Soviet Union, will come into operation in Vilnius. It will be heard on FM and 73.34 MHz frequencies in stereo. The transmitter's power—four. The program will feature much music, live discussions, interviews, and reports on youth life. The station is financed by Vilnius municipality, local firm sponsors, and youth organizations. The radio station M1 appeals to foreign states and privately-run commercial radio stations.

Our alternative station is seeking partnership abroad. We are ready to supply Lithuanian music records, recordings, information on the developments in Lithuania—aspiring to its political sovereignty—[and to] advertise your firms having contacts with this country, your goods and services. For our part, we are interested in the latest information on music, compact discs, records and professional studio equipment. Write to us at the address: Youth Radio Station M1, Post Office Box 1747, Vilnius 19, Lithuania. Telex 261143LOSC Soviet Union. We invite you to cooperate.

Lithuanian Party, State Appeal on Crime

90UN0253A Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 20 Oct 89 p 1

[Appeal from the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet Presidium of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, and the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers to the Inhabitants of the Lithuanian SSR]

[Text] This appeal has been brought about by the considerably increased crime in the republic and the negative trends which are being traced, and which cannot fail to be a cause for concern to the state and society. As many crimes have now been recorded in a number of cities and neighborhoods as were committed in all of the preceding year. The number of crimes of violence—homicide, aggravated assault, rape and muggings—is on the rise. Theft of citizens' personal property has spread; thieves are breaking into apartments and are stealing automobiles. Low labor discipline, an inefficient protection system, slack departmental supervision and other factors are engendering the embezzlement of state and public property. Also flourishing is the "shadow" economy: owing to the chronic shortage of commodities, when illegal transactions are at times covered by the signboard of individual labor activity or cooperatives, all kinds of smart operators are living as parasites on the working people, and profiteering is rife. Criminals are becoming increasingly brazen. City streets have become unsafe, and the inhabitants of farmsteads live in fear of attack. Increasingly young people are taking to crime. Many crimes are associated with drunkenness, moonshining and drug-taking. Criminal recidivism is spreading.

Many party, state, and public organizations have recently been paying less attention to educational and preventive activity in the work force and at citizens' places of residence and are failing to provide for people's increased assertiveness in safeguarding public order. The principle of the inevitability of responsibility for having committed a crime is not being properly realized in the republic through the fault of the law enforcement authorities to a considerable extent. Many crimes are being detected belatedly or remain unsolved altogether. The volunteer formations which hitherto helped maintain public order and detect crimes have essentially ceased to operate. There is marked reluctance on the part of some of the population to help the police and the investigating authorities and to testify in court about the circumstances of a crime. Owing to such passiveness, some persons are disposed rather to helping the offender escape responsibility than honestly performing their civic duty.

The opinion, which has taken a firm hold in society, that responsibility for the increase in crime lies solely with the law enforcement authorities is frequently supported by certain media. Of course, the law enforcement authorities are obliged to abandon outdated forms and methods of work and must work vigorously and promptly in the execution of their duties, but the criticism leveled at them must be constructive and well-founded also. The situation is further complicated by the complex legal reform which is underway currently and which, incidentally, was begun in the absence of a pertinent concept of the fight against crime. However, even under such circumstances, when the outdated law enforcement system unsuitable for a society in renewal is being restructured and a new one is being created, disregard for the law cannot be permitted.

The difficult circumstances which have come about are compelling an emphatic intensification of law enforcement work: An interim committee to combat crime has been set up by edict of the Supreme Soviet Presidium of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], a comprehensive crime-fighting program is in preparation, laws are being stiffened, and a draft police act will shortly be submitted for public discussion. It is planned to improve the working conditions of people working in the law enforcement sphere and to improve their provision with special equipment. Efforts are being made to create a crime-fighting system in keeping with the nature of the law-based state; that is, to protect the republic's citizens against crime by methods conforming to the rules of international law.

It is very important that the strictest atmosphere of intolerance of crime and of lawbreakers being unable to escape punishment be created in each city and neighborhood and in each work collective. It is essential to radically improve the education of the younger generation.

Currently the majority of inhabitants of Lithuania are actively endeavoring to realize their civic and political rights. This is a legitimate phenomenon promoting a renewal of society. However, we must not in the heat of political life forget a lurking danger: Crime could destabilize the political and economic situation. The fight against crime is simultaneously a fight for a sovereign Lithuania, for the inhabitants cannot be free in a state in which criminals feel at ease. Crime under present conditions is an insidious ally of the enemies of Lithuania's revival operating inside the republic.

The Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers appeal to all public organizations and movements and all people of good will to join forces and by joint efforts rise to the fight against crime.

We appeal to all inhabitants, labor collectives, the youth, and people of the older generation of Lithuania to perform their civic duty, refusing to be reconciled to antisocial behavior, molding intolerance of all breaches of law and order, and supporting the police, other law enforcement authorities, and public organizations standing on guard of public order.

We will not create a democratic society if its members are in the grip of fear of falling victim to criminals. Without a resolute struggle against crime and other negative phenomena, national revival and perestroyka in all walks of life will be in jeopardy.

Brazauskas on December Party Congress

90UN0254A Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 20 Oct 89 p 1

[ELTA report: "The Party on the Road to Perestroyka"]

[Text] The Kaunas city party organization will be represented by 113 delegates at the forthcoming 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party. The opinion of the members of one of the largest delegations at the congress will be important to the adoption of program documents of the party that will be meaningful for the future of Lithuania. The future congress, and the preparation of problems associated with it, was one of the main subjects of the meeting of Kaunas residents with Algirdas Brazauskas, the first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee.

On 19 October A. Brazauskas visited this important economic and cultural center of the republic. He met in the gorkom [city party committee] with the secretary and members of the gorkom bureau. A. Brazauskas also visited the Lithuanian veterinary academy and the wool production association "Drobe," and expressed an interest in labor and living conditions and in problems that were being decided in the collectives. In meetings with members of these collectives, he talked about the political situation in the republic, and the actual situation on the way to achieving the sovereignty of Lithuania and the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party, and he answered numerous questions.

A meeting of party activists of the city was held in the evening in the social and political activity center. Speaking to the meeting, Algirdas Brazauskas told Kaunas residents about the most pressing tasks of the day. The speaker emphasized that the 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party will be a turning point in the history of the Lithuanian Communist Party. The party is assuming responsibility for the future of the people and of all inhabitants of Lithuania and for their destiny.

For a long time, questions of the internal and economic life of the country were decided by the command method. This distorted the relationships between people and inflicted great damage on the economy. The structure of the industry, which was not scientifically based, and the inclination to giantomania [gigantomaniya] led to critical features in the ecological situation. Insufficient attention to local conditions and disregard for the interests of the people engendered crisis phenomena in providing the population with the basic necessities and food, and it resulted in an abnormal migration, which complicated the resolution of many problems. In recent years, this was also felt by residents of Lithuania. They are troubled by how society will get rid of these negative phenomena and the role that the Lithuanian Communist Party will play in this situation.

Today the position of the party with respect to perestroyka is clear and simple. The slogan "the plans of the people are the plans of the party" has become the main slogan in the party's activity. The party is aspiring to realize the dream of Lithuanian residents to restore the sovereignty of the state. This does not mean that we are calling for a break in economic, cultural, and other ties with the USSR and with the other republics. But the ties

must acquire a new content, and they must be based on partnership and equal rights.

The republic has to change from an executor of instructions and decrees to master of its own economy, its own land, and its own wealth. This is a difficult and long path that we have to take, overcoming the resistance of the conservatives, stereotypes, and the inertia of the thinking of the central organs. The Lithuanian Communist Party is now the only real force in this process in the republic. The future steps of the party on this path will be determined by the future congress. These steps have to be carefully thought out with consideration for the real situation, because hasty decisions do not bring anything good. Our weapon in this difficult matter is the cohesion and unity of the party rank and file and cooperation with all progressive movements.

In giving an assessment of the economic situation of Lithuania, the secretary of the Central Committee emphasized that the main thing for our industry today is technical progress and an increase in the quality of production. We still have only a few enterprises whose articles meet the best world standards and that are capable of competition on the world market. Therefore, it is very important to introduce scientific achievements in production, and to develop ties with foreign firms, first of all with those that could help not only with credits, but also in the improvement and renovation of production. It is not only new articles that can become a market commodity, but the ideas and concepts of the scientists as well.

On the path to achieving our objectives, we should proceed from constructive decisions and legislation. The Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] has already adopted a number of important laws and is preparing to adopt a new package of laws: laws on citizenship, the referendum, etc., and amendments to the Constitution that expand the rights of citizens and that give a new interpretation to state-church relations.

At the present time, the committee on preparation for the 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party is working intensively. It is important to prepare for the congress the kind of draft documents which would reflect the resoluteness to accelerate the perestroyka process. We have to consider the complexity of the situation, the structure of ties with the CPSU, and to delineate specific sectors of activity in the contemporary stage and in the future.

Many questions were asked at the conclusion of the meeting, and proposals were made in which communists expressed their ideas and doubts on urgent current questions.

Gomel Party Obkom Replaces First Secretary

PM0111152589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Plenums Held"]

[Text] Gomel, 28 Oct—A plenum of Gomel Oblast Committee [Obkom] of the Belorussian Communist Party has been held to examine an organizational question.

The plenum released A.S. Kamay from his duties as first secretary of Gomel Obkom in connection with his election as secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee.

A.A. Grakhovskiy, who was working as chairman of Gomel Oblast Soviet Executive Committee, was elected first secretary of Gomel Belorussian Communist Party Obkom.

Exarch to Belorussia Appointed

LD1011214589 Moscow TASS in English 1953 GMT 10 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 10 TASS--The Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church has appointed Metropolitan Filaret of Minsk and Byelorussia the Exarch to Belorussia. The title of Metropolitan of Minsk and Grodno was conferred on him.

This decision was taken under instruction of the bishopric council of the Russian Orthodox Church in St. Daniil Monastery in Moscow in October this year.

According to the Council's decision, a new Exarchate was formed in Belorussia. Mogilev, Polotsk and Pinsk episcopacies were reinstated.

Extremist Activities Increase in Ukraine

90UN0232A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 18 Oct 89 p 3

[Article by PRAVDA UKRAINY correspondent: "In the Public Prosecutor's Office of the Ukrainian SSR"]

[Text] The tasks of the organs of the public prosecutor's office of the republic to strengthen the fight against organized crime, its prevention, and its eradication were discussed at a meeting of the collegium of the Public Prosecutor's Office of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. The information of S.F. Litvinchuk, deputy prosecutor of the republic, and the reports of the public prosecutors of a number of oblasts, analyzed the reasons for the increase in the republic this year of number of crimes that were carried out with particular brutality, entailing murder, assaults by thugs, robbery, torture, and extortion.

In Lvov, Odessa, Kharkov, Ivano-Frankovo, Crimea, Ternopol, and some other oblasts, and in the city of Kiev, the activity of various nationalistic and extremist

organizations with an antisocial tendency was intensified. They frequently openly come out with anti-Soviet and anti-socialist slogans, and they try to destabilize the situation. There has been a rapid increase in cases of unsanctioned meetings and demonstrations, the preparation and distribution of leaflets of a subversive and slanderous nature, violations of law and order, and crimes in the economic sphere.

Attention has been turned to the fact that law enforcement organs do not always demonstrate resolution in suppressing such cases. The actions of subunits of organs of internal affairs are sometimes ineffective. Frequently the prosecuting attorneys do not stand on positions of principle and do not sanction the arrest of persons who commit serious crimes, and whose guilt is proven, and the judges allow liberalism in determining punishment measures.

The collegium required that oblast prosecuting attorneys and transport prosecuting attorneys positively strengthen surveillance over adherence to laws that are aimed at fighting organized and group crime and cases of inflaming interethnic hostility. For the purposes of protecting the interests of the state and the safety and rights of citizens in the fight against this evil, the force of law must be used in full measure.

It has been proposed to investigate the existing situation everywhere, to introduce the necessary proposals by temporary committees in the fight with crime, to improve the cooperation of law enforcement organs with the executive committees of local soviets, trade union, Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] organizations, and labor collectives in order to ensure the timely exposure and investigation of crimes, and to make offenders answerable as required by law. The prosecuting attorney organs should render principled assessments of cases of violation of state and labor discipline, mismanagement in the use of transport, and other law violations in the sphere of economics, and in each specific case to resolve the question of the responsibility of the guilty parties.

Recommendations have also been made to stimulate work in explaining the law to the population and to ensure the expansion of glasnost in the activity of law enforcement organs in the fight against crime.

New Evening Paper in Ternopol

LD1311134189 Kiev in Ukrainian to North America 2200 GMT 9 Nov 89

[Text] Authorities in Ternopol have decided to initiate a new daily paper—TERNOPOL VECHIRNIY [Ternopol at Evening]. This is connected with the fact that of late political life in the oblast center has become more lively. The need has arisen to illustrate more fully and widely all aspects of restructuring, economic reforms, and democratization and to enable representatives of many public movements to have a say and to cater more broadly for the pluralism of attitudes.

Moldavia: Proclamation of Gagauz ASSR Illegal

PM1411192389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Report by own correspondent Eduard Kondratov: "The Gagauz Issue"]

[Text] Kishinev—Monday was quiet in the Moldavian capital. Restrictions on motor traffic entering the city have been lifted and the wrecked Ministry of Internal Affairs building is being tidied up. The investigation is continuing into the circumstances surrounding the events of the October and militia festivals. A group of senior CPSU Central Committee officials has met with the people of Kishinev and the emergency state commission has been operating.

The Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium was in session until late, considering, among other things, a very acute issue that has a definite connection with the development of events in Moldavia. It was occasioned by another unusual event: On Sunday 12 November, in Komrat, a city in the south of the republic, the participants of an extraordinary congress of the Gagauz people adopted a resolution on forming a Gagauz Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] as part of the Moldavian SSR. And they asked the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet to approve the decision.

The issue of autonomy for the Gagauz—a Turkish-speaking people, most of whom have lived in southern Moldavia for more than 175 years peaceably alongside Bulgarians, who migrated at the same time, and also with Moldavians, Ukrainians, and Russians—has cropped up many times in recent years, but with particular vehemence this year. Three months ago the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet set up a commission to study the autonomy issue and the work is almost finished. But the Komrat congress delegates decided not to wait for its conclusions, and 12 November was proclaimed the day of the rebirth of the Gagauz people. The Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet was presented with a fait accompli.

But after an intense debate on Monday the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium did not deem the decision by the Gagauz people's congress legal. And, of course, not because it was ignoring the cherished dream of nearly 150,000 Gagauz—to feel for the first time a full-fledged people with their own statehood. On the contrary: Respecting every nation's and every people's constitutional right to self-determination, the Presidium members talked with sympathy and understanding about the aspirations of the Gagauz. But do legislators have the right, even with the best motives, to violate the constitution, their basic law? Of course not. The congress in Komrat had no power to set up a new state entity—it could only ask that this be done.

This time a very large number of people had been invited to the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium session—chairmen of rayon soviet executive committees, lawyers, and experts. Having analyzed the data with

their assistance, the Presidium members were at pains to explain that by no means all the inhabitants of the rayons included in the Gagauz Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic proclaimed by the congress would readily accept autonomy. Particularly as in many of them the Gagauz population is in a minority. In Bessarabskiy Rayon, for example, only 3 of the 14 villages are for autonomy; in Tarakliyskiy Rayon, which is inhabited mainly by Bulgarians, more than 80 percent of the inhabitants were not for it, and in Chadyr-Lungskiy Rayon it could only be a question of Gagauz-Bulgarian autonomy, but the Moldavian villages do not support that either.

Moreover, as the Supreme Soviet Presidium members noted, what was originally meant was the creation of Gagauz autonomy only in areas where the population is concentrated. Now, apparently, they are talking about a group of southern rayons, where there are many villages with mainly Moldavian, Ukrainian, and Bulgarian populations. What about their wishes? And what about the ethnic "patchwork"?

While not approving the decision of the Komrat congress, the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decided to wait until the commission studying the issue of Gagauz autonomy has finished its work before deciding such a crucial question. This time it has been given a tight deadline—1 December.

Moldavian People's Front Blamed for Violence

PM1511105589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 15 Nov 89 Second Edition p 3

[MOLDAVIAN TELEGRAPH AGENCY (ATEM) article reprinted from SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA of 11 November: "Lawlessness—the Path to the Abyss"]

[Text] Every country and each people have national holidays that are especially dear to them. One such holiday for Soviet people is 7 November, the day when we celebrate the Great October anniversary. Each year on this date which is sacred for our people we evaluate all we have done during the past years and decades and make plans for the future.

We realize that the 72 years since the Great October Socialist Revolution have not been a victorious and triumphant march beneath cloudless skies. Consequently, that much more importance is attached to our cohesion for the sake of implementing the goals of perestroyka, of reviving the genuine ideals of and renewing socialism. Proof of people's faith in perestroyka can be seen in the businesslike atmosphere at the festivities dedicated to the October revolution's 72d anniversary. Party and soviet organs and labor collectives in our republic and its capital and soldiers from the Kishinev Garrison did a lot to ensure that this day was really bright and festive. And this is how it was on the whole.

But it did transpire again on that day that there are people who see no benefit in the atmosphere of businesslike efficiency and organization, of calmness and creativity, which is so necessary in the present crucial period; that there are forces which are ready to resort to anything in order constantly to fan tension in the sociopolitical situation. It was these forces that cast a shadow over the November festivities in Kishinev.

It has already been reported that this was the first time that supporters of the Moldavian People's Front [MPF] had been given permission by the city soviet to participate in the festive demonstration in their own official marching formation. They blocked the passage of military equipment even before the military parade had started. Dozens of members of the aforementioned organization, their minds set on this unlawful action, climbed on tanks and armored personnel carriers and these vehicles simply did not reach the square, even though the soldiers had spent a long time preparing for the traditional ceremonial march-past.

At the end of the demonstration, MPF supporters flooded the square and, to all intents and purposes, wrecked the tail end of the holiday demonstration. Had militia staffers responded in kind to the actions by members of the MPF formation, what could have happened in the square would have been irreparable.

The intention to wreck the military parade and working people's demonstration was conceived by MPF supporters long before 7 November. That was their main objective, and MPF leaders knew it. Preparations for this action were especially stepped up following the receipt of permission for a separate formation to march past. It was headed by G. Gimpu and other leaders. When the situation became exacerbated to the limit, G. Gimpu started complaining to the authorities that people had gotten out of control, that they were simply not their people at all.

Militia staffers took the appropriate measures to prevent the military parade and working people's demonstration being wrecked. In an attempt to prevent a potential buildup of conflict, 60 of them suffered bodily harm of varying degrees. It has become known that three citizens had called at the city's medical institution by the evening of 7 November, claiming that they had suffered bodily harm during the demonstration.

MPF members carried provocative antiparty and antisocialist slogans: "The Party—the Cynicism, Shame, and Insanity of Our Time," "Down With Communist Dictatorship," "The November Putsch—Tragedy of the Peoples," "The October Revolution Drowned Democracy in Blood," "2 December 1917—Bessarabia's National Independence Day," "Sfatul tseriy [as transliterated; meaning unknown]—the Will of the People," "No to Borders Dividing Romanian Kin," "Romanians, Awake," "Ascent Into the Mountains, Access to the Sea," "Down With Imperial Thinking," "Striker! Take a Lease on the Non-Chernozem Zone!" Insulting shouts

were hurled at the Soviet Army, and marchers in the formation waved a banner proclaiming "The Army—Beyond the Dnestr! No One Is Threatening Moldavia."

Uncontrolled people in their thousands swept aside the barriers, scaled the visitors' stands, and trampled the flowers laid at the V.I. Lenin monument on the festive occasion. And all this camouflaged beneath a slogan in support of perestroyka.

The MPF actions evolved into an unauthorized rally in Victory Square and an unauthorized march along Lenin Prospekt which disrupted city transport operations.

When giving the MPF permission for its formation to participate in the demonstration the city authorities warned that, in the event of a conflict situation developing through the MPF's fault, its leaders would bear full responsibility for any possible consequences according to current legislation. In reply to this, the MPF leadership declared its awareness of this responsibility. But the front's leaders failed—for the umpteenth time!—to keep their word.

Let us be blunt: The MPF leaders' strategy and tactics, quite simple but no less irresponsible for that, are becoming increasingly transparent—announce some event or other, be it a rally, a demonstration, or a meeting, assemble as many people as possible there, get them "psyched up," and if events start taking an unpredictable and dramatic course—then they move aside and pretend it has nothing to do with them.

Following every unauthorized rally or march you can see this for yourself time and again: The MPF leaders are either incapable of influencing their followers or unwilling to do so in pursuit of far-reaching goals and guided by the principle "The worse things are the better." It is hardly necessary to prove that the former is as dangerous as the latter. The "ostrich" stance by the leaders in question gives a free hand to people who, in the course of events held under MPF auspices, systematically commit breaches of public order, beat people up, bring transportation to a standstill, and overturn and destroy cars. It is noteworthy that MPF leaders have never, not even once, publicly condemned such actions or distanced themselves from those committing them. It is well known that silence also indicates a stance. Maybe unprincipled, but a stance nonetheless.

There is no point in even talking about any correspondence between declarations by the MPF leadership and the real actions by leaders and supporters of this social organization which is officially registered by the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers. How can anyone describe as sensible and morally justified any actions which lead to confrontation, violence, and the fanning of interethnic dissension? How can anyone call for the creation of a rule-of-law state in words while in deeds constantly breaching the existing laws and public order?

Is it not unprincipled to demagogically hold forth against the administrative-edict methods of leadership and against the legacy of Stalinism while you yourself resort to strong-arm pressure, ultimatums, defamation of opponents, and violence against those who disagree with you? Not just moral violence, moreover, but—as recent events show—physical violence as well. These are not isolated instances. On 8 November a group of persons who had assembled at the monument to Stephen the Great launched an unprovoked attack on citizens V.I. Romanov and V.A. Samoylov. Somewhat earlier, MPF supporters attacked an ATEM photojournalist, hit him several times, and robbed him of the expensive photographic equipment issued to him.

Can anyone describe as honest and proper the behavior of those who, while accusing others of distorting reality, deliberately disseminate misleading information about events in Moldavia, falsify the nature of events organized by the MPF, and systematically make use of the services of Western radio voices in the process?

Is it not hypocritical, while hiding behind portraits of the leader of our state and slogans in support of perestroyka, to engage in actions leading to destabilization of the situation and obstructing the achievement of compromise, accord, and consolidation of all forces for the sake of the calm and constructive labor so badly needed now by perestroyka?

The answers to these question would seem unambiguous. There is no doubt that the people, in whose name the irresponsible loudmouths are supposedly acting, will be able to distinguish between those who are sincerely concerned with the interests of the cause and really take on responsibility for the country's future, and those who aim for cheap popularity and engage in fruitless demagoguery and "criticism for criticism's sake." Let us recall V.I. Lenin's words when he described demagogues as the worst enemies of the working class, capable of dooming the masses to the most bitter trials.

But let us revert to what happened in the square. The crowd's passions, constantly and skillfully fanned by some people, at times became frankly challenging and threatening. Someone might object as follows: Nobody, they might say, manipulated the formation's actions. This is untrue! We have before us an objective document—a photograph. Here they are—people with faces distorted by malice (and their numbers, by the way, seem to swell on every subsequent occasion), and in front of them a female member of the MPF aktiv openly directing them. Some of this organization's leaders make increasingly loud attempts at rallies to present their narrowly selfish opinion as the opinion of the whole people, and to impose it on the authorities, frequently in ultimatum form.

And here we have other photographs—proof that even children and adolescents are being involved in political extremism. As a matter of fact they are quite deliberately enlisted in rallies and in protest and disobedience

groups. How can we fail to recall what Dostoyevskiy wrote: "No abstract ideas or principles imposed on people are worth the tears of even a single child."

It is well known that there are a number of Communists in the MPF leadership. But what is their stance on unlawful, extremist, and provocative actions by the front's supporters at events organized by it? What is their evaluation of the antiparty and antisocialist slogans which the MPF formation brought out 7 November?

In their letters and telephone calls to the editorial office people are asking a reasonable question: Why is it that MPF leaders—primarily CPSU members, including USSR People's Deputy I.D. Khadyrke, chairman of the front's Executive Committee and full-time secretary of the Moldavian SSR Writers' Union party organization, N.Kh. Kostin, docent at Kishinev State University (who actually teaches scientific communism), and other of its leaders who carry party cards—"wash their hands" and evade responsibility for unlawful actions by the social organization they head? And finally, when will party committees progress from fruitless reprimands to specific actions and produce a proper appraisal of Communists who participate in events where one can hear antiparty and antisocialist calls and slogans which are incompatible with the CPSU Program and Statutes?

In this context let us recall V.I. Lenin's words that "everyone is free to write and say whatever he likes, without the slightest restrictions. But every free association (including the party) is also free to expel any members who take advantage of the party's name to preach antiparty views."

People ask: Why is it that laws are increasingly often broken with impunity; are the authorities in a position to put an end to manifestations of extremism and the fanning of interethnic dissension? Will law and order, tranquillity, and the opportunity to work in peace be guaranteed, or will those who disturb public order continue to get off with just another warning? Does this mean that the resolutions on breaches of public order in Kishinev adopted by party and soviet organs are nothing but a fiction?

Extreme positions have become dominant in the activity of the MPF—or its leaders and many of its members at least. This is already perfectly obvious. The organization is increasingly distancing itself from its verbal and written promises and is openly promoting slogans which are overtly anticommunist, have nothing in common with the concept of socialist pluralism, and run contrary to the party's ideological tenets. Another feature of the MPF's style of action is the unbridled defamation of some and the equally unbridled eulogization of others.

Why is it that people who place personal ambitions above the CPSU Statutes and Program, who engage in destructive work while carrying party cards in their pockets, are still in the party? It seems that the time has come for party committees, the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, and the Moldavian Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers to at long last produce the proper party and political evaluation of the activity of Communists who head informal organizations which engage in antisocialist and antiparty attacks and unlawful actions or who participate in events organized by them.

If the MPF has one "traditional" slogan for all its events it is: "ATEM Is a Disinformation Agency." It appears virtually everywhere MPF supporters gather and bears eloquent witness to the enmity and intolerance which they inspire for those who correctly and objectively report the front's illegal actions and reveal its antisocial activities. Obviously MPF leaders would be happier if all the mass media were subordinate to them, so that they could "guide" obedient journalists in their reports. Isn't the MPF planning to introduce its own censorship which would give the "OK" only to its interpretation of events? This is a strange concept of pluralism and glasnost, you will agree. Incidentally, if you listed all the cases of MPF representatives presenting a distorted picture of events, particularly in information passed by them to the Western press and radio voices, the list would run to several pages. What is the point, for instance—as was particularly seen in an interview with Yu. Roshka, one of the MPF leaders—of constantly exaggerating dozens of times over the number of participants in MPF events?

The way in which our journalist colleagues in the central press covered the demonstration and military parade in Kishinev confuses us on a purely professional level. "The banners called for a fundamental turnaround in Moldavia's political and economic destiny..." stated one respected newspaper. Another newspaper correspondent touchingly wrote: "Various tongues could be heard in the festive columns—Moldavian, Russian, and Ukrainian songs were in the air."

But it was not just in support of perestroyka that songs and slogans were heard in Victory Square 7 November. Other calls were made—and very vocally at that. The following, for instance: "Perestroyka as a historic reality means the end of the empire called the Soviet Union." And it is no secret what kind of "turnaround" was being called for by the slogan "Ascent into the mountains, access to the sea" and the demand to unite Moldavia within the borders depicted on the 1774 map of Moldavia....

This is a highly dangerous political phenomenon, and, if we look truth square in the eye, we cannot fail to see that it is gaining strength. Its aim is obvious—to discredit the party and the republic's leaders and ultimately to destabilize society and seize power.

The 27 October 1989 letter from Kishinev City Prosecutor V.D. Pener in response to a request from Deputy I.D. Khadyrke notes that in the first 9 months of this year 35.7 percent more crimes have been recorded and the number of murders, robberies, and muggings have increased compared with the same period last year. The prosecutor also writes: "...The unsanctioned rallies and

processions held by MPF supporters, during which hooliganism and group breaches of public order often take place and there is a need to bring in additional numbers of internal affairs organ officials who should primarily be combating crime, are having an extremely negative effect on the day-to-day situation and the stabilization of the position in the city. In this connection I ask you as a USSR people's deputy and leader of the MPF to take measures to prevent the organization and staging of various unsanctioned events in the city by members and supporters of the MPF, which fact will promote the strengthening of public order in the city."

Do you think that at the next rally USSR People's Deputy I.D. Khadyrke brought this appeal from the prosecutor to the attention of MPF supporters and called for people to show calm, prudence, and the proper responsibility borne by MPF members in the current situation? No way. This was not done...

The following question to USSR people's deputies is also natural: Why has none of you even once said, "People, What are you doing? Stop and think!"?

Today more than ever all of us need calm, caution, and good sense. At this complex time, which requires supreme responsibility from everyone, any wrong moves and hasty calls or decisions could have a pernicious effect on our common cause. The path of confrontation, violence, and lawlessness along which certain MPF activists are encouraging people is a shameful path....

The success of perestroyka and the fate of the republic and the country depend on the clear and principled position of each of us. And one would like to believe that reason will prevail. There is no other way.

Georgian Demonstrations Against Conscription Noted

PM1311121189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Nov 89 First Edition p 2

[Own correspondent Lieutenant Colonel V. Kaushanskiy report: "Tbilisi: Fall Pickets"]

[Text] Lieutenant General L. Sharashenidze, the republic's military commissar, arrived at Government House and, leaving his vehicle in the inner yard, went out into the square where the protesters were. It was drizzling and the people were huddling in warm shawls and blankets, making themselves as comfortable as they could on mattresses brought from home.

The general looked around for a few moments, glanced at the banners of slogans hung between the columns, and went up the steps. He was spotted immediately and respectfully allowed to pass through. He rejected a suggestion that he use a microphone and quietly asked the lads on the mattresses to come closer so that everyone taking part in what we will call a sit-in could hear him. Attitudes to the fall draft was just one of the list of problems debated in the square.

The military commissar later told me that he had only once heard a disrespectful shout from the crowd, to which he immediately reacted: "You think I love Georgia less than you do?"

I have known Levan Levanovich a long time. He is a career political worker. He has been in the Army for almost 40 years and joined the republic's Military Commissariat after being deputy chief of a District Political Directorate. He is typically Georgian in being a sociable and witty raconteur, is full of enthusiasm despite his age, and is always among people. But this evening he unusually found himself morally isolated, even though he was standing shoulder to shoulder with hundreds of his countrymen who had gathered to boycott the fall draft to the Armed Forces.

Several protests attended by comparatively few people have recently been held in Tbilisi. Draft-age guys gathered outside the Palace of Sport to express their attitude to their forthcoming Army service and a group of residents of the Abkhaz Autonomous Republic who, so they stated, were simply tired of waiting for measures to be taken to normalize the situation in the Abkhaz Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, had taken up position on the steps of the State Museum of Modern Georgian Art since 26 October. And the more people joined the ranks of the protesters—and they were supported by virtually all the republic's informal organizations—the less available space was left on the narrow area in front of the museum.

On the evening of 29 October the wooden fence which had protected the territory in front of Government House ever since the sad events of 9 April was dismantled, and that same evening an organization calling itself the Georgian Main Committee for National Salvation decided to stage a joint protest. A protest about the 1920 treaty between Georgia and Russia, the April events, the fall draft, and the fate of the residents of Abkhazia.

The square outside the museum emptied, and dozens and then hundreds of people gathered outside Government House with the blessing of the main committee, which unites under its auspices the National Democratic Party, the Helsinki Group, the Royalist Party (there is one), and the Democratic Party—virtually all the forces which have placed themselves in opposition.

That is a short lead-in to how the republic's military commissar came to appear one rainy evening before an increasing mass of people.

The slogans that the general had to use in addressing the young people can hardly have pleased him. I will not repeat them. I will merely note that the Army, to which Levan Levanovich has devoted a large and—he believes—the best part of his life, and in which it is his job to supply new recruits, is known here solely as an army of occupation. It is probably not the army in which the grandfathers of the youngsters in the square fought—and how they fought. Well, never mind the slogans—you can see and hear them in towns and villages everywhere

to the discordant accompaniment of tirades about glasnost and pluralism. We have even had appeals to the United Nations (some of these were written in English outside Government House), but, as far as I am aware, none of the countries of the world community is rushing to Tbilisi. The old democracies, as the saying goes, respect criminal codes, constitutions and laws, and are dealing with their own accumulated problems.

The general also talked about respect for the law, since many of the protesters are no longer talking about service merely on the republic's territory but are casting their net wider, so to speak: They are raising the question of not serving in the Army at all. That is why the draftees among the students who had gone AWOL from their units—which the military commissar noted with sadness—were such an organic part of the overall picture. The commissar warned the young people present not to enter into conflict with existing legislation, and expressed a desire to help them get to the bottom of the current difficult situation with the draft.

Readiness for dialogue... Today, like some kind of vector of efforts, it determines the thrust of the work of the republic's party and soviet organs. On the evening of 30 October G. Gumbaridze, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, spoke on TV. Again the party leader referred to ideas understood by the people—the ideas of a comprehensive and balanced approach to the choice of ways to solve any urgent problems, including draft service in one's home area, responsibility for the consequences of any ill-considered actions, and the consolidation of all society's healthy forces.

And yet, within the framework of the interethnic dialogue—and this is clearly visible from the republic press—is a search under way for ways to ensure Georgia's economic sovereignty and solve the age-old ecological problems, of which there are more than enough in the area? Academics, public figures, and economists are painstakingly calculating the republic's potential.

But now the dialogue with certain representatives of the public on military issues concerning the country's defense interests and requiring no less professionalism is being conducted in fits and starts, with clear priority given to initiatives "from above." This, in particular, was mentioned by Lt Gen L. Sharashenidze at a recent session of the Transcaucasus Military District Military Council devoted to the situation prevailing in the Transcaucasus in connection with the fall draft.

After all, experience—and quite interesting experience at that—is already at hand. Dozens of delegations comprising representatives of the Georgian public along with party, soviet, and All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League workers have toured the country accompanying their charges to their place of service. Direct and very close contacts have been set up along what could be called "republic-regiment" lines, many central newspapers, including KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, have carried reports on these unusual events, and the Georgian experience has been of interest to other republics too. We can only regret that the local newspapers—above all, the youth newspapers—have ignored this and a number of other initiatives, leaving the subject of the military draft to samizdat leaflets, which are very widely distributed nowadays, thanks to the progress in the sphere of duplicating equipment. But you should not look for serious economic or demographic arguments dictated by the country's defense interests in these leaflets. Don't bother. Their "compliments" for the Army are couched in the style of the inscriptions on the placards of the demonstrators outside Government House.

Incidentally, let us assess the situation at first hand. After the aforementioned military council session, in which Givi Grigoryevich Gumbaridze and Army General N. Popov took part, I asked the republic's military commissar to answer a few questions.

[Kaushanskiy] Levan Levanovich, to what extent does the picture currently visible outside Government House reflect the overall state of affairs on the draft on a republic-wide scale?

[Sharashenidze] These few hundred people are the most radical. And, of course, they are not the people who determine the position on the draft. Despite the fact that the past few days have been quite busy for military commissariat workers, the republic will fulfill all the set plans. This is shown by the statistics from virtually all of Tbilisi's Rayon Military Commissariats. The picture is stable in the cities of west Georgia, Abkhazia, and Adzharia. I make no secret of the fact that there are a dozen military commissariats which are feeling the effects of all kinds of actions by the demonstrators. The number of "dissatisfied" people stands at around 1,500, according to my figures. Some of them were unable to get into military educational institutions, and some want to serve only in Georgia. Some young men did not show up at the draft centers at all, laying themselves open to prosecution. But the main thing is that the overwhelming majority of both the draftees themselves and their parents take a correct view of the Army's role in our society. Many mothers and fathers are demanding that their offspring not be left in Georgia under any circumstances.

[Kaushanskiy] Incidentally, as far as we are aware, the percentage of young men who will be granted this privilege is small.

[Sharashenidze] Yes, of the order of 25 percent. And the privilege will be granted above all to those who are married, who have children, who have difficult family circumstances, and so forth.

[Kaushanskiy] One of the demonstrators' arguments refers to the growing number of Georgian guys who have been killed in the Army. How would you comment on that?

[Sharashenidze] There have undoubtedly been some sad cases. But we should not give them purely ethnic overtones. Often the cause of death is not bullying, still less interethnic discord, but tragic accidents—to which, alas, nobody is immune—together with violations of safety measures, and so forth. You know, I suggest that each such case be published in the open press with a detailed description of the cause of the tragedy. That would eliminate at a stroke all the unnecessary talk that gives rise to speculation.

[Kaushanskiy] Do you intend to continue the dialogue?

[Sharashenidze] Absolutely! For instance, my speech will be carried on republic TV. There have also been a number of interesting ideas on this score. But let's not jump the gun. [Sharashenidze ends]

From the editorial office: Stop press. It is reported that the demonstration outside Government House is over—the square in front of the building is empty.

Armenian Catholicos Vazken Comments on Anniversary

NC1311174389 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1900 GMT 12 Nov 89

[Excerpts] Dear compatriots, journalist Varujan Voskanyan lately visited the Mother See of Edzhmiatsin and interviewed Vazken I, Supreme Patriarch and Catholicos of all Armenians. Here is the interview. [passage omitted].

[Begin recording] [Voskanyan] Your Holiness, how do you asses the restructuring in our country, the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] movement and the struggle for liberation of the Armenian people ?

[Vazken I] We follow closely developments along the new paths of restructuring and democracy in the USSR. We note especially the developments in a number of particular [word indistinct] republics where new principles and movements are taking shape under the slogans of national autonomy and (?diversity) [words indistinct].

Similar movements took shape and are taking shape in Soviet Armenia as well. We consider these natural and commendable whenever they are expressed judiciously and far-sightedly. We are convinced that Soviet Armenia must gradually strengthen its national self-rule without becoming detached from the great family of Soviet nations.

Under the present conditions, Armenia could hardly survive without the political protection and economic assistance of the Soviet Union. The demand of the NKAO's Armenian population to unite with mother Armenia is of course natural, legal, and compatible with the sacred right of national self-determination. Our government in Armenia, as well as the entire people, have supported our brothers and sisters expecting a solution (?providing for unification).

This was evident in recent weeks by the public statements of the responsible leaders of Soviet Armenia and of the Armenian deputies both at the Armenian Supreme Soviet and at the USSR Supreme Soviet. It is encouraging that unity prevails between our governement and the people in this and similar fundamental problems. It is preferable if this continues. We too, as the first servant of the Armenian church, expect a just solution to the painful problem of NKAO.

[Voskanyan] Your Highness, what preparations are the Mother See making to commemorate the anniversary of the declaration of Christianity as a state religion in Armenia?

[Vazken I] That is the very history of our people, of our spiritual and cultural development. The year 2001 will mark the 1700th anniversary of the historical event of declaring Christianity as the state religion in Armenia. [passage omitted].

[Voskanyan] Our people are following with devotion the patriotic creative activity of holy Edzhmiatsin, the spiritual center of Armenians. Will your holiness explain briefly the current activities of the Mother See?

[Vazken I] In this period of reforms, our holy church too is experiencing a new period of development. There is a renaissance of religious (?feeling) in our nation. Six monasteries and 14 churches have (?reopened) in Armenia, NKAO, and Leningrad. Other churches too will be reopened thanks to the benevolent, and even encouraging, attitude of our state authority. To enable our church to conduct its mission more extensively, we must speedily prepare new spiritual servents. With this in mind we increased the number of students at our seminary this year to 70. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Armenian-Language Computer Program Developed

NC0411173489 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0200 GMT 4 Nov 89

[Text] The Armenian branch of the International Computer Society, in cooperation with the society's members from Moscow, has developed a unique Armenian language communications unit called AYAZ for personal computers. It ensures mutual communications between Armenia and the diaspora; between the Armenian communities here and abroad; and between enterprises, organizations, schools and individuals.

It could be used for computer training, electronic postal service, organization of teleconferences, and for the publication of Armenian electronic newspapers. The unit can adapt functions for foreign languages, process texts, and process and relay information through different channels in both Armenian and English. AYAZ has advantages similar to other units. It relays information to the screen faster and has more function keys. It can be mastered within a few hours.

It has long been difficult to prepare computer programs in the Armenian language. Now the Armenian alphabet has taken its worthy place among those languages that can be used on computers.

Yerevan External Broadcasting Viewed

NC0311133389 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 0800 GMT 29 Oct 89

[Excerpts] A [word indistinct] number of the western Armenians who had escaped the Turkish sword found refuge in the most diverse countries of the Near and Middle East, Europe, and America after a brief period of wandering. [passage omitted]

Because of the expenses involved in running mass media and because of the accursed diktat of the iron curtain, it seemed that the diaspora Armenians would be deprived of the right to communicate with their ancestral home. Then suddenly the media of the airwaves came into existence to shape the important path of communication between the unjustly scattered groups of the same people. The Soviet Armenian Government spared no effort to create and develop ties between Armenia and diaspora Armenians, and encourage repatriation. [passage omitted]

Despite the economic and social difficulties of the postwar period, the Armenian Communist Party, acceding to the wishes of the Armenians of Armenia and of the diaspora, decided to organize daily broadcasts for Armenians living abroad. Thus, on 10 August 1947, the Voice of Armenia reached the diaspora through a short-wave radio station, with the following announcement: "Yerevan speaking. Dear compatriots, we begin our daily broadcast for the Armenians living abroad." [passage omitted] Initially, 1-hour daily broadcasts were relayed to the Armenians living in Near and Middle Eastern countries. [passage omitted]

Gradually the geographical scope of our radio broadcasts expanded. Soon an Arabic section was opened and thus Yerevan's voice reached the Arab world. This 1-hour daily program tells our millions of Arab listeners about Armenia and about Armenian-Arab relations. In 1959, Radio Yerevan started broadcsats for the Armenians living in European countries. [passage omitted] Some years later, Yerevan radio reached first to North and then to Latin America. On 5 August 1962, the renowned astrophysicist Viktor Ambartsumyan greeted our compatriots living in North America [passage omitted]

It is now 42 years since Yerevan's program for foreign countries first went on the air. At first its employees numbered 11; now they exceed 70. There are two main editorial branches.[passage omitted] Yerevan radio broadcasts for more than 8 hours continuously every day. Thanks to our casts in English, French, Spanish, Turkish and Persian summaries and Arabic broadcasts, Yerevan Radio engages in airwave conversation with the Armenian and foreign listeners of more than 50 countries of the world.

The programs broadcast for the Kurds living in Armenia are also listened to in a number of Soviet republics and foreign countries. [passage omitted] Judging from our letters program, our radio's audience is growing. We receive almost 1,500 letters per year, according to which the quality of the reception of our broadcasts is unsatisfactory in North America and certain countries in the Near East. In order to fill in that gap and satisfy the needs of our music-loving compatriots, Yerevan radio dispatches a very large number of recordings each year to the Armenian radio stations abroad, cultural societies, and individuals. [passage indistinct] The directors of the Radio Armenia in Montevideo, the Independent Armenian Radio of Boston, and the Armenian radios of Los Angeles, Brazil, France, Cyprus, and others have established close links with our radio and we are happy to fulfill their requests by sending the requested recordings. [passage omitted]

Assyrians Form Society in Armenia

NC0411205489 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 3 Nov 89

[Text] Yerevan, 3 Nov (ARMENPRES)—An association called "ATUR" has been established by the constituent conference of the representatives of the Assyrian people living in Armenia. The association brings together the representatives of the Assyrians who have become dispersed all over the world. A section of them fled from the Ottoman Turkey during World War I to escape genocide and found a second homeland in Armenia.

The aim of "ATUR" is to provide comprehensive assistance for the preservation of the national culture and language, strengthen the fraternal ties between the Assyrian and Armenian peoples, cater to the spiritual and cultural needs of the Assyrians living in Armenia, and to contribute to the mutual enrichment of the cultures of two fraternal peoples.

An Assyrian song and dance ensemble and a club for courses in Assyrian, Assyrian history, and study of their culture will be attached to the association. A literary group will also be formed.

Return to Classical Armenian Orthography Sought

NC2710113589 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 26 Oct 89

[From the review of the 25 Oct HAYRENIKI DZAYN weekly]

[Text] Yerevan, 26 Oct (ARMENPRES)—The weekly has published a lengthy article by Doctor-Professor of Philological Sciences Rafayel Ishkhanyan entitled "Sooner or Later We Have To Return to the Classical Orthography." The essayist refers to the alterations introduced into Armenian orthography between 1922 and 1940, explains their absurdity, and points out that the reinstatement of classical orthography has become

the demand of the times and is supported by many intellectuals and all diaspora Armenians.

Azerbaijan Upgrades Relations With Allied Republics

NC1511083789 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 11 Nov 89

[Text] As the newspapers have already reported, the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers adopted a decision in may 1989 to broaden its practical relations with the Councils of Ministers in allied republics and their apparat. Putting this into effect, a group of the workers from the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers apparat visited the fraternal, allied, and autonomous republics. During the exchange held, protocols were drawn up for joint work by the apparats in the future. The need for such a practice was mutually approved and considered. The establishment of close cooperation between cultural administrations, publishing houses, and mass media organs and the exchange of [word indistinct] collectives have been considered on the basis of the program drawn up to strengthen interethnic relations and consolidate the international training of workers.

A group of workers affiliated with the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers was sent to Turkmen SSR. The workers were warmly welcomed in that republic. [Words indistinct] and an exhibition of books by Azerbaijani authors were opened in Ashkhabad at the time of the visit.

A group of workers from the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers apparat traveled to Tajik SSR recently. The Tajik SSR Council of Ministers Presidium upheld the suggestions made by the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers and said that establishing permanent and businesslike relations will add a new aspect to traditional relations and contribute toward improving the fruitful ties between the two republics.

Meanwhile, workers from the Tajik SSR Council of Ministers apparat were invited to visit Baku for the same reason.

Azerbaijan's 9-Month Socioeconomic Results Noted

NC1411120589 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 10 Nov 89

[From the Republican Press Review]

[Text] The newspapers contain information made available by the republic's state statistics committee on social and economic development in Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic over the past 9 months. The information was published in a report entitled: "Backwardness Must be Removed and a Basis Created for 1990," which said the following:

The [words indistinct] for strengthening the social direction of industrial production has continued. The number of organizations channeled to [words indistinct] were increased. Although the volume of group A products has decreased, the volume of group B products increased by 1.7 percent. The plan for the retail sale of commodities has been overfulfilled. Meanwhile, the process of adopting and applying wide-ranging forms and methods for managing the economy was maintained. A total of 12 industrial establishments and construction organizations, 115 retail, trade, and industrial establishments, and a number of other establishments were managed themselves.

Regardless of all this, the republic's economy developed under complex conditions. The social and economic situation became acute, particularly during the third quarter. The weakening of work and [word indistinct] discipline and the interethnic disputes and strikes, particularly the railway transportation strikes, have had significant effects on this state of affairs. Freight was not delivered to the republic because of the railway transportation strike. Consequently, [word indistinct] increasingly weakened and less was produced of important varieties of products.

An acute situation continues to exist in the [word indistinct] market. Many of the most important commodities have become more scarce. There has also been a drop in the number of houses and social and cultural installations commissioned in the republic.

The state statistics committee report said:

The outcome of the social and economic development in the republic over the past 9 months indicates that for the 1989 plan to be successful, work collectives in all areas of the economy must significantly upgrade their work and increase their responsibilities during the fourth quarter.

Baku Reports on Border Trade with Iran

NC0311081389 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 1 Nov 89

[Text] Border trade between Iran and the Soviet Union is increasing. The signing of documents between an Iranian state firm and foreign trade organizations in Azerbaijan on the question of cross-border barter trade is a clear indication of this.

Safari, who is the director of the Iranian firm, has said that the documents were signed while an Iranian trade exhibition was being held in Baku. According to the agreements, Iran will export electrical equipment, [word indistinct], clothing, shoes, and so forth. In return, it will import electric motors, [word indistinct] products, and machine tools.

Safari said: It is estimated that the annual quantity of (?goods to be exchanged) within the framework of the border trade [words indistinct] will be worth $5 million.

Turkmen Drug Traffickers Sentenced

LD1311142389 Moscow TASS in English 1411 GMT 13 Nov 89

[Text] Ashkhabad November 13 TASS—By TASS correspondent Yelena Prikhodko:

The trial of 20 Soviet drug kingpins in Turkmenia's Supreme Court have ended in long prison sentences for the accused. The drug-traffickers were seized by KGB men in the republic. Gold, valuables and a considerable quantity of drugs, worth a total of a million roubles, were confiscated from Rakhimov, one of the leaders of the gang.

Pyotr Arkhipov, chairman of the republican KGB, told TASS that investigate one of the major drug trafficking channels across the Afghan-Soviet frontier in the area of Takhta-Bazar. An organised criminal group which functioned with impunity under the patronage of head of the Takhta-Bazar Regional Interior Department Kakabayev for almost two years was discovered. "A green triangle" on the frontier of Afghanistan, USSR and Iran in the area of the Serax settlement was long the cause of anxiety. Criminal activity of a group of Iranian smugglers, who tried to transfer over 250 kilograms of opium from Afghanistan to Iran over the Soviet territory, were foiled.

A total of over 300 kilograms of raw opium wre handed over in the past three years by the KGB to public health agencies to be used for medical purposes.

Kazakh Party Central Committee Holds Plenum

LD1411133889 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 1500 GMT 13 Nov 89

[Excerpts] The 17th plenum of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan Central Committee was held today [13 November]. The following issues were submitted for the plenum to review: convening the regular 17th Congress of the Kazakh Communist Party; the political platform of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee; the elections of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] people's deputies and local soviets of people's deputies; progress in restructuring the republican party organizations' ideological work, and on the tasks aimed at making it more effective. The plenum heard a speech by Comrade Nazarbayev, first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, convening the 17th congress of the republican Communist Party and adopted an appropriate decision to be published in the press.

At the plenum Comrade Anufriyev, second secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee delivered an information report on conclusions of the discussion at party organizations and the press concerning the draft political platform of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee and on the elections of the Kazakh SSR people's deputies and local soviets of the people's deputies. The plenum approved this platforum and instructed the Central Committee Bureau, oblast committees, town committees, and rayon committees of the party and primary party organizations to ensure that its provisions are given wide publicity, using all means of organizational and ideological influence to ensure the electors of the republic adhere to the main lines of restructuring and reform of the political system.

At the plenum Comrade Dzhanibekov, secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, delivered a report on progress in restructuring the republican party organizations' ideological work and on the tasks aimed at making it more effective. [passage omitted]

The concluding speech at the plenum was delivered by Comrade Nursultan Abish-ogly Nazarbayev.

The plenum adopted a wide range of decisions on the issues under discussion, which will be published in the press.

The plenum examined organizational matters. The plenum approved Comrade Yedilbayev as chief of the Interethnic Relations Department of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee. The plenum approved Comrade Murtazayev as editor of the republican newspaper, SOTSIALISTIK KAZAKHSTAN. The plenum removed Comrade Borovkov from membership of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee in connection with his departure from the republic. The plenum transferred Comrade Chichenkova from candidate member to member of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee. [passage omitted]

Kazakh Supreme Soviet Calls for Nuclear Test Halt

LD1411222589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] Today in Alma-Ata there was a session of the Supreme Soviet of the Kazakh soviet socialist republic [SSR]. The draft of next year's state plan for the republic's economic and social developoment was examined. The Supreme Soviet adopted a decision on the state plan for the Kazakh SSR's economic and social development for 1990, taking into account the amendments introduced by the deputies. The republic's state budget for next year was also approved, as was the report on the implementation of the state budget for 1988.

In the decision on the concept of self-government and self-financing for the Kazakh SSR, the Supreme Soviet took into consideration government reports on the work carried out along these lines. Taking account of the proposals being received, and in connection with the forthcoming adoption of the laws of property, land, and others, it instructed the Council of Ministers to finish working on the draft of the concept and to present the draft laws on this question for the consideration of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet.

Deputies unanimously adopted an appeal of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet to the government of the country

and to people's deputies of the USSR on halting [prekrashcheniye] tests on the Semipalatinsk nuclear test-site.

Elects New Officials

LD1511103989 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 1500 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] The Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet has appointed Supreme Soviet Balkash Moldabay-ogly Tursunbayev as chairman of the Kazakh SSR State Agroindustrial Committee.

Republic, Local Boundary Disputes Aired

90US0152A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 2 Nov 89 p 3

[Interview with V. Dudarev, deputy section director in the department of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet for matters dealing with the work of the soviets of people's deputies, by V Shcherban: "Uncertain Borders"; date and place of interview not specified; first two paragraphs are SELSKAYA ZHIZN introduction]

[Text] These borders were never guarded. There are no patrols here, no plowed border control strips. And frontier guards do not watch the border. For decades they have not even been mentioned, as if they did not exist. One border was visible—the state border. The others were not taken into account. But the latest "boundary conflicts" remind us that the quiet slumber of republic, oblast, and rayon borders is fraught with explosive potential. And an explosion did occur...

We met with V. Dudarev, deputy section director in the department of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet for matters dealing with the work of the soviets of people's deputies.

[Shcherban] Boundary conflicts... Truly, these words ring of the Middle Ages. And one might think they came out of nowhere. After all, 70 years ago the peasants obtained the land for their use. And there never was a social basis for conflict because of land allotments. But controversy arose this spring along the boundary between Kirghizia and Tajikistan that plunged many into shock. Is history moving backwards?

[Dudarev] Alas, these problems have always existed. But people preferred not to mention them aloud. Yet we knew that where you have fertile lands and rich pasture, forests, and reservoirs, and where you also do not have enough fertile land, there are disputes along the boundary. It is common knowledge that even today people carry boundary posts so as to be able to cut off a few plowed hectares for "their own" land. Trivial, you say? Well, in the south a hectare of plowed land is reported to be worth R500,000. We have seen instances of this in Trans-Carpathia, in Central Asia....

With respect to the dispute over the small section of land between the Tajik and Kirghiz population on the border between Isfarinskiy and Batkenskiy Rayons, we can sum things up by saying that for centuries the people here lived peacefully. But when the Tajiks found themselves living in close quarters in the kishlak—they have a high birth rate here—they asked to be allocated a parcel of land adjoining the kishlak, but located in Kirghiz territory, for building. The border passes literally just beyond the outskirts. But a certain portion of the Kirghiz population saw this request as an attempt to change the territorial border. And in response to their refusal to allot this parcel of land, the other side shut off the water supply to the homes and fields of their Kirghiz neighbors. As you know, USSR people's deputies went out to visit the area in conflict, and immediately let the water through to the Kirghiz side. They are also examining the question of allocating the land for building.

[Shcherban] The map of our country is covered over with a thick network of little borders. They are all so winding and so broken—you are forced to think there must be some ulterior motive to all this. How do you appraise the situation with all these little boundaries? Is there reason to be troubled at this?

[Dudarev] They are treated differently in the various republics. In regions where the villages have become depopulated, no one has anything to do with rayon or oblast borders. The situation is different in, say, Central Asia, where every plot of land has its special standing.

But there are problems of another variety. Entire peoples were resettled at one time from the North Caucasus. After retracting the unjust accusations, people began returning to the lands they had held from time immemorial. But...these were occupied by a population of another ethnic group, resettled there from the mountain regions. Situations of conflict arose. For example, the territory of the former Aukhovskiy Rayon in Chechen-Ingushetiya was transferred to Dagestan. Novolakskiy Rayon is now located on this territory. Many problems remain today related to the return of a population to this region that had lived there earlier.

[Shcherban] Excuse me, but I am not aware that anybody in Moscow is working on this.

[Dudarev] According to the USSR Constitution, all questions of administrative-territorial organization fall within the competence of the union republics.

[Shcherban] Stalin and Khrushchev made their "contribution" to breaking up little borders. People left their land, abandoned their huts and shacks. But strange and not always explainable things have happened with borders in the recent past...

[Dudarev] Indeed, republic borders changed even after Stalin. There was the transfer in 1963 of three rayons in Kazakhstan's Chimkentskaya Oblast—Kirovskiy, Pakhtaaralskiy, and part of Kzylkumskiy to Syrdarinskaya Oblast in Uzbekistan. This took place entirely in conformance with existing law and the matter proceeded, it was explained, "from universal state interests,

with the aim of eliminating separation of the Golodnaya Steppe lands, effecting their economic assimilation and most efficient use as rapidly as possible in order to increase production of cotton and other agricultural production." But then in 1971 the above-mentioned rayons were again transferred from the Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] to the Kazakh SSR, also entirely in conformance with the law...

[Shcherban] The Main Administration of Geodesy and Cartography keeps so-called reference maps with precisely plotted borders in all regions. The accuracy of the plots is certified by signatures of leaders of neighboring republics. But not all the borders between Central Asian republics have the signatures of both sides on these maps. It turns out not everyone agrees to today's borders there. Why is this?

[Dudarev] I am not aware of any instances of contention at an official level regarding established borders in the Central Asian republics. The borders between them were fixed during the national demarcation of 1924-1929. At that time cartographic material did not exist on which the graphic outline of established borders could be depicted with sufficient accuracy, and they were not appropriately designated on the ground. At the same time, the need arose to more clearly define certain border sections, and this was done from time to time by republic commissions constituted on an equal footing.

With regard to the absence of signatures of responsible republic officials certifying the correctness of borders plotted on maps... Evidently this could be done by virtue of the circumstances as mentioned earlier...

[Shcherban] In Siberia, the Far East, the Non-Chernozem Zone, even in the Moscow area you can travel hundreds of kilometers and not find any hint of the existence of a rayon or, let us say, an oblast border. Essentially, they have become a formality in these regions. Perhaps because there is so much land here? But if that is the case, why did they engage in such bloody fighting on the boundary prior to Soviet rule in that very same Siberia?

[Dudarev] Apparently this occurred because from that time on they separated people from the land. In such a situation, "little" borders were wiped out, figuratively speaking; they were no longer observed. If people do not have an interest in community land, they do not get concerned with its borders.

[Shcherban] In 1917 we repudiated much of what existed prior to the revolution. How were matters decided involving province [guberniya] and administrative division [uyezd] borders? Were they dismantled?

[Dudarev] The administrative-territorial scheme for the Russian Empire was first introduced by Peter I and further developed during the reign of Catherine II. The province and administrative division structure underwent no fundamental changes over the following 200-year period. A boundary committee under the senate was functioning at that time since a fight ensued over every plot of fertile land.

In administrative divisions, for example, a special land surveyor handled questions related to land allocation, border establishment and supervision, and consideration of land disputes. Among the people this person was often referred to respectfully as the boundary man. His was one of the most honored professions in Russia. By the way, a boundary institute existed under the tsar for training these specialists, which was renamed during the Soviet era the Moscow Institute of Geodesic, Aerial-Photography, and Cartographic Engineers.

Province and administrative division boundaries in the country were basically retained during the years 1917-1922, insofar as the former administrative-territorial structure remained intact.

[Shcherban] All questions on changing borders and renaming oblasts, cities, rayons, and settlements are reflected in the Directory of Administrative-Territorial Division of the Union Republics. This is a true guidebook in the sea of names of cities, rayons, and stations... It is found in practically every organization. You participate in drawing up these directories and would therefore know better than other people—are there many requests for changes in rayon boundaries? Why does this happen?

[Dudarev] As of 1 January 1989, the country had 6 krays, 114 oblasts, 3,193 rayons, 2,190 cities, 628 rayons-in-city, 4,026 city-type settlements, and 42,712 rural-area soviets. It should be noted in particular that the number of rayons and, to a significantly lesser extent, of oblasts changes from time to time for different reasons. Their borders also change as this takes place.

In 1962-1963, when kolkhozes [collective farm], sovkhozes [state farm], and rayons were united, almost half of all the rayons in the country were abolished. From 3,421 in 1962 they decreased in number to 1,845 by 1964. They also thoughtlessly reshaped the administrative-territorial division then established. Here they gave no thought to people—they just vigorously cut and sliced. After the kolkhozes and sovkhozes were enlarged, up to 80 or more built-up areas existed in the Non-Chernozem Zone. At times the farm managers did not know where some of them were located, and all of this was complicated by the lack of roads.

We were really messed up, as they say, in our rayon zoning of that time. Today the situation has basically stabilized. Even now, however, there are instances where the population of one village or another requests transfer to a neighboring rayon. There are a variety of reasons for this but, as a rule, such requests reflect a desire to bring enterprises and organizations providing everyday services, communications, health care, education, and organs of authority nearer to the population. For example, they build a main, hard-surface road alongside

a village. You have to travel half an hour along it to reach the center of the next rayon, and then it takes over 3 hours to get to "your own." But people have to be able to go to the store and back, to the market place, visit the schools.

[Shcherban] However, the map of our country is being reshaped today. Brand new rayons are springing up in Orlovskaya and Kurskaya Oblasts, in the Smolensk area... And this at a time when villages have become depopulated.

[Dudarev] It would be more correct to say: not new rayons being formed, but those which were abolished at the beginning of the 1960's, as a rule, being resurrected. As I already stated, prior to the enlargement of our country's rayons, there were more than 3,400 of them; following this, half remain. But actuality itself required that the abolished rayons be resurrected.

Indeed, the villages in certain places, especially in the Non-Chernozem Zone, have become depopulated. Rayons are being formed here in which only 10,000-12,000 people reside and the percentage of retired people is very high. But scattered around them are beautiful fields, pasture, and hay fields. And the desire to put these resources into operation for the development of agricultural production is understandable. In addition, the critical requirement arises in the midst of our backward infrastructure, especially in the Non-Chernozem Zone, to somehow bring sociocultural facilities and the organs of authority closer to the population by resurrecting earlier existing rayons. As examples of this we can point to Znamenskiy, Krasnozorenskiy, Soskovskiy, Trosnyanskiy, and Korsakovskiy Rayons in Orlovskaya Oblast, resurrected in recent years. Along with other measures, this decision facilitated increased agricultural production in the oblast.

[Shcherban] There have also been great changes in recent times in the borders of rural rayons, whose territories are being "swallowed up" by cities...

[Dudarev] We all know that cities grow, and that there is not enough land for housing and industrial construction, or for creating infrastructure. Sovkhozes and kolkhozes which border cities are, as a rule, the suppliers of agricultural production to those cities. And the transfer of lands, especially plowed lands, to meet the needs of the city has a painful effect on the economy of these farms. For example, 350 hectares of plowed land were withdrawn from agricultural use in the rayon of the city of Shcherbinka—presently Moscow's Sovetskiy Rayon. Many similar examples throughout the country could be enumerated. In that same Moscow Oblast which shows a sharp insufficiency of arable land in general, certain city authorities attempt, by fair means and foul, to remove lands from agricultural enterprises for construction.

[Shcherban] As a rule, the borders of rayons, oblasts, and farms coincide with roads, streams, and ravines... But you can construct a new road way off to the side, you can fill up ravines, and the river itself can change the course of its streams... Is someone monitoring the accuracy of borders?

[Dudarev] No one ever makes comparison checks. From time to time cartographers and land surveyors just verify the names of built-up areas, rivers, and summits.

After all, the borders are permanently registered.

Further on Baklanov Visit to MiG Plant

PM0611092589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Increase Labor Contribution"]

[Text] The eve of the October Revolution is a responsible stage in the life of Muscovites and all the country's workers. Perestroyka increases many times over each labor collective's responsibility for the end results of work and requires an even more specific and purposeful quest for ways and opportunities to make progress in every area. Such is also the mood now among workers at Moscow's A.I. Mikoyan Machine Building Plant, which was visited 2 November by CPSU Central Committee Secretary O.D. Baklanov.

The country is indebted to that enterprise for the creation of the famous MiG aircraft. One of them, the MiG-29, is well known to specialists, and not only those in the Soviet Union. This machine recently gave convincing demonstrations of its aerial capabilities at world air shows in Britain and France. The great interest which our aircraft attracted and the deserved evaluation which they received are a reflection of the high prestige and scientific and technical potential of our country, which is radically modernizing its industry. The recognition that was received by no means engendered complacency within the collective. This is borne out by the new developments with which the aircraft makers acquainted the CPSU Central Committee secretary.

In the life of the enterprise and its highly skilled collective this year has been in many respects a difficult and even crucial period. A long-term strategy has to be chosen. The processes of conversion, which have also had a significant impact on the plant are not viewed here merely as the mechanical shortening of the production runs of machines under development. The main task in these conditions, the CPSU Central Committee secretary stressed, is to achieve a higher standard of designs and ensure a rapid model replacement rate for industry. Furthermore, these models must be in line with the highest demands of the times.

The formula "Quality, not quantity" enables the aircraft builders to use some capacities for the solution of important tasks. These include the production of equipment for agricultural production and the processing of output as well as machinery and mechanisms for light

industry. Aircraft builders are paying increasing attention to supplying the domestic market with goods which people particularly need.

The collective has plenty of good ideas in this respect. But why are many of them not implemented? Why do most of the goods developed here for the market still not have specific manufacturers to produce them? These questions require an immediate answer, the CPSU Central Committee secretary said. You can only create so many exhibition models. As Soviet people implement perestroyka they want to see tangible results of their work and improvements right now. We have no more time for shillyshallying.

Shillyshallying is all the more intolerable when it comes to the solution of questions of the collective's social development. The collective's potential will be realized to the full only if the working people are constantly aware of being surrounded with concern. The CPSU Central Committee secretary inquired especially thoroughly about this aspect of the aircraft makers' lives.

Around 500 of the plant's workers are now on the waiting list for improved housing conditions. But the construction of housing by the own-resources method is developing at a clearly unsatisfactory rate at the enterprise, as the CPSU Central Committee secretary pointed out. He noted that housing construction by that method is a task of paramount importance, and its implementation should be constantly monitored by the management and all the plant's social organizations. It was noted that it is necessary to build housing in rayons in the immediate vicinity of the enterprise.

This is one of the many measures that must be resolved in order to retain the cadres of the unique production facility as solicitously as possible. There is already a shortage, especially of machine tool operators, the aircraft makers say. A number of skilled specialists have succumbed to the attraction of higher wages in the cooperative sector.

In these conditions, surely, one should pay special attention to people's needs and fight for every production worker. But workers and engineers at the plant which produces some of the world's best aircraft have to wait in line for their meals. Canteen facilities are available at the enterprise for only one-third of the collective.

Questions in need of urgent examination were touched on. There was a discussion, for example, on improving pensions for test pilots. People whose lives are bound up with the improvement of new aircraft equipment must have secure social protection, the CPSU Central Committee secretary noted.

His comradely conversations with aircraft makers began in the workplace and continued at a meeting of the enterprise's party and economic aktiv.

A number of the questions related to the plant's future in conditions of the transition to modern forms of economic management and conversion, people asked about the innovations in party building and the deepening of socialist democracy, and many are concerned at the fact that the perestroyka processes in society are running into obstacles and hindrances. The main concern voiced in the speeches and rejoinders was how to eliminate the bottlenecks more quickly. This can only be achieved, participants in the meeting said, by constantly increasing the labor contribution of every collective.

O.D. Baklanov was accompanied by O.S. Belyakov, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Defense Department, and other party and economic leaders.

Zaykov, Others at Technicians' Congress

LD1311151989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1350 GMT 13 Nov 89

[From the "Novosti" newscast; A. Kozhukhova video report]

[Text] The first all-Union congress of machine-building technicians opened today in Moscow. Taking part in it are around 800 specialists from all the Union republics as well as scientists from many of our country's academic institutes and major higher educational establishments. Representatives of the leading machine-building firms in the United States, FRG, Japan, and a number of the socialist countries have also been invited.

A letter of greetings from Comrade Ryzhkov was read at the opening.

Comrade Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, read a report.

The aim of the congress is to unite the country's scientific-technical potential to create new technologies in Soviet machine building, to perfect existing ones, and to speed up their implementation in practice. The activity of various kinds of specialists is now in increasing need of coordination.

Comrades Zaykov and Baklanov were present at the congress. [video shows congress in session, Silayev at rostrum, Baklanov and Zaykov on platform]

Andrey Brezhnev Interviewed on TV

LD1311112789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2027 GMT 10 Nov 89

[Video report on interview with Andrey Brezhnev by unidentified correspondent; date, place of interview not given—live or recorded]

[Text] [Video shows correspondent standing with A. Brezhnev on the street]

[Correspondent] Andrey, a year ago NEDELYA published an article entitled Naslednichki ["dear little

heirs"] and I know that after publication vicious official censure in relation to yourself ensued [orgvyvody].

[Brezhnev] Yes, it is indeed so. I was working in the Foreign Ministry and (Petrovik) summoned me and asked me to write an explanatory note with regard to this. The main issue was—how could I say this better—not whether this article is the truth, but whether there stood on the table in front of me a bottle of cognac, as incidentally was written.

[Correspondent] And after this you were sacked?

[Brezhnev] Well, I can't say that I was sacked, but after this there was such a clear indication that it was better for me to leave the Foreign Ministry.

[Correspondent] I offer my apologies. I feel very uncomfortable that I let you down in such a manner. So, it is difficult to be a Brezhnev in 1989?

[Brezhnev] Difficult is not the word—and it was not simple before.

[Correspondent] For instance?

[Brezhnev] A previous or a current instance?

[Correspondent] Current.

[Brezhnev] One instance stands before you. An episode with my brother, Leonid, can serve as a second example—he was forced to switch his child from one school to another, under another surname. And all just because, not only children—the child came home in tears—not only the children but the teachers, let us say...

[Correspondent] Torment.

[Brezhnev] Tormented, yes.

[Correspondent] (?Tormenting) and the search for enemies is a relic of Stalin. In general the Brezhnev surname is associated not only with the General Secretary Leonid Ilyich but also with Galina Brezhnev, spouse of the unfortunately well-known Yuriy Churbanov.

[Brezhnev] You understand, she is from one family and we are from another family. As far as I am concerned, for instance, I maintain very good relations with the daughter of Galina Leonidovna, Viktoriya, a very close person to me, to whom I owe a lot.

[Correspndent] You are friendly with Dima Sakharov, son of the academician.

[Brezhnev] Yes, this is indeed so.

[Correspndent] Strange connection.

[Brezhnev] Nothing strange about it. We were neighbors. We met about 15 years ago. We were boys, and like all boys we were friendly with each other.

[Correspondent] I know that you had a lot of friends in the institute. You went for a labor term to build in Kazakhstan. Did you really not have the opportunity with your status as the grandchild of the General Secretary to avoid this labor obligation?

[Brezhnev] Well, I do not consider that it is a labor obligation for myself. I simply wanted to go there. And then the majority of my friends went to this construction detachment and I considered: in what way am I better than others?

[Correspondent] Exactly 7 years ago the country found out about the death of the General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev. How and when did you find out about this?

[Brezhnev] I was doing practical work abroad then—incidentally, for the first and last time—and the ambassador summoned me and handed over a telegram in which it said that I had to return home on the very first flight. This slightly surprised me because I had not received any of what we call "endorsements." But on the evening news program I heard that they were reporting from Moscow that rumors were going round that Leonid Ilyich had died and the sense of the telegram became clear to me.

[Correspondent] Andrey, the last question may seem unpleasant perhaps. Many are convinced that all the Brezhnevs as before enjoy nomenklatura benefits—state dachas, special rations, cars, and so on.

[Brezhnev] Well, none of the Brezhnevs use these benefits besides my grandmother Viktoriya Petrovna. I consider that she has deserved this.

[Correspondent] Me too. Thanks for the interview.

Attitudes to Restoring Volga Republic Discussed

PM1311142589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent V. Kornev report: "Dialogue Not Confrontation. Volgograd Inhabitants' Opinion on the Restoration of German Autonomy"]

[Text] Volgograd Oblast—V. Ritter, member of the Soviet Germans' Coordination Center Presidium (he is also director of the consumer service association, member of the party city committee [gorkom], and deputy of the city soviet) chose the party gorkom for our first meeting in Kamyshin. There, in the office of Gorkom Secretary G. Kozlova, we introduced ourselves. However, as soon as she rose from her desk in order to leave us alone so that we could talk, Ritter protested:

"Why, Galina Viktorovna? Have we stopped trusting each other? After all, we are working together."

Indeed, how many conflicts have been settled thanks to joint action. What they mean by joint action here are constant contacts with people on the part of party and soviet officials and authoritative representatives of the Soviet Germans, constant contacts rather than intervention only when the situation begins to deteriorate.

Reasoned explanations help, of course, to defuse the situation but the restoration of the autonomy of Soviet Germans in the Volga region is connected not only with economic and social problems. It also touches on national sentiments. At the social level, sometimes the situation is reduced to hostile relations and mutual recriminations.

I read the assessments of the situation after trips to Saratov and Volgograd Oblasts by working groups of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities Commission on the Problems of Soviet Germans. One of them reads: The statements and proposals made in the course of the talks can be summed up as follows: "It is inexpedient to raise the question of restoring the Soviet Germans' autonomy in Saratov Oblast." The group which visited Volgograd and was headed by the commission's chairman, USSR People's Deputy G. Kiselev, described a different mood: "The overwhelming majority of people view the restoration of the Soviet Germans' autonomy positively. Soviet and party officials express the same opinion." One of the main arguments is: The German population has been living in the Volga region for more than 200 years. And furthermore, the restoration of autonomy would be an act of historical justice.

It was from this interpretation of history, from the awakening sense of justice that the path toward dialogue began in Kamyshinskiy Rayon. Currently 10,000 Germans live here, one-third of the total living in the oblast. It is therefore understandable that as a result of this circumstance, of the oblast's five rayons which were wholly or partially located in the [former] Volga German Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR], Kamyshinskiy Rayon was most likely to become the arena of confrontation. The mounting tension at the social level, the least controlled level, also boded no good. Such conflicts leave painful scars on people's souls which take a long time to heal.

Journalists on the local newspaper LENINSKOYE ZNAMYA have been covering the "German topic" for about a year. The newspapermen were subjected to the first onslaught of emotions when they first featured the autonomy issue on their pages after it had been discussed only in lobbies.

I have read these articles. Their headlines speak for their content: "In the Absence of Guilt, No One Can Be Guilty." "There Is Nothing That Divides Us." The newspaper invites readers: "We are waiting for specific proposals, thoughts, and wishes. One thing must remain unchanged in your letters: The Soviet Germans are members of our fraternal family." The journalists also furnish food for thought: "All the country's nations and ethnic groups have suffered, but in respect of the Soviet Germans justice has never been fully restored. Does this mean that the Soviet Germans are now entitled to submit their claims for flouted rights and the suppression of their culture? I believe that they are. But, of course, not against the Russian people, as some people would have us believe. The Russian people were the first to fall under the brutal onslaught of Stalinism," journalist V. Bronchenko writes in a roundup of letters received by the editorial office.

Allow me to clarify. Kamyshin itself was not part of the Volga German ASSR and the question of changing its status has not been raised.

"The main thing today is to prevent a flareup of passions," G. Slyshkin, first deputy chief of the Ideological Department of the Volgograd party oblast committee [obkom] told me. "Therefore we have clearly defined the main points with which we are approaching people: Restoring the autonomy of the Soviet Germans in the Volga region means restoring justice, and all the people who live on the territory of the former ASSR must take part in the discussion of this question."

The "passions" are frequently based on all kind of rumors and fabrications. Rumors are being spread, causing agitation not just in Kamyshinskiy Rayon or Volgograd Oblast. People in villages in Kamyshinskiy Rayon were, for instance, worried about the news that spread along the grapevine that after the restoration of the Volga German ASSR Russians would begin to be evacuated from the republic.

"We had to explain," V. Ritter says, "that this was a fabrication, that the policy documents of the 'Rebirth' All-Union Society of Soviet Germans contain entirely different objectives."

Ritter took part in the elaboration of these documents and has been elected member of the leadership of that society.

"We declare," the appeal to the population living on the territory of the former Volga German Autonomous Republic reads, "that having experienced together with the entire Soviet people the tragedy of the war, with its innumerable sacrifices, we cannot reclaim the houses and property illegally confiscated in 1941 during the evacuation, since it is not the Soviet people who are to blame for this, least of all the people who live in our houses today."

The appeal was printed in the Kamyshin newspaper. It provides answers to many questions which, because of the lack of information, had earlier caused a lot of rumormongering, as a result of which the possibility of the restoration of autonomy was rejected categorically, so to speak, without further thought. I do not want to overuse quotations but I would like to cite one more sentence from the statutes of the "Rebirth" society: "Members of the association are obliged to actively combat all phenomena aimed at insulting the national dignity of representatives of other Soviet people, curtailing their rights, and showing disrespect toward their national needs, customs, and traditions."

We visited writer Dominik Golman, who told us about himself. He spent his youth in Kamyshinskiy district, and later studied at the Engels City Teacher Training

Institute, becoming lecturer and senior lecturer at that institute. He compiled a German grammar for the German high school which was reprinted twice within a short time. However, he became more and more interested in literature. In 1940 he became member of the Soviet Writers Union. Then came exile to a forsaken village in Krasnoyarsk Kray, the labor army at Vyatlag... When the situation in the country changed, D. Golman returned to pedagogical work. He published books in German. On the eve of his 80th birthday he was awarded the Order of the Friendship of Peoples. He really is, as he describes himself "a living history of the German question." On the table lie the books which he has written. The novels "Fall Storm and Spring Noise," "Broken Windows," and the story "Red Cavalrymen."

"Not having a republic of their own," D. Golman says, "my people are losing their language and culture and forgetting their customs.

And these words are the bitter truth. At the "Semenovskiy" State Farm, where there are quite a few Germans, the library has issued only three books in their native language in the course of a year. In was planned to organize teaching in the German language as the mother tongue in a number of schools in the rayon, but difficulties arose immediately. There are not enough teachers and no textbooks.

"My brother and sister have left for the FRG," I. Bayer, a former worker now retired and working as a freelance phototographer for the local newspaper who was present during our conversation, says, touching on another problem. "If we had our own republic this problem would probably not have arisen. And what is more, judging from the letters of those who have left, I can say that if autonomy is restored, many will return."

Irrespective of the optimistic conclusion of the working group which visited Volgograd Oblast, there are also quite a few opponents of a restoration of autonomy. We must conduct a dialogue and argue with them and persuade them. There will, of course, be opponents who will accept no arguments, but in my opinion no one should be able to say with justification: "Everything was decided without consulting us."

V. Kalashnikov, first secretary of the Volgograd party obkom and USSR people's deputy, said in an interview published in VOLGOGRADSKAYA PRAVDA that the restoration of the autonomous republic calls for much organizational and also explanatory work. The best relations have always existed among Volgograders—Germans, Russians, Ukrainians, Kazakhs, Tatars, and Jews. "And I believe," V. Kalashnikov went on, "that the establishment of a German autonomous republic would in no way cloud these relations. On the contrary, the traditional feeling of internationalism which is characteristic of Soviet people will help them to resolve old and new problems within a short time and to create the necessary conditions for the establishment of a republic."

Plant Official Analyzes Exodus From CPSU

PM0211145789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Oct 89 Second Edition p 2

[Article by A. Maksimov, party organization secretary at the Ulyanovsk Motor Vehicle Plant's Nonferrous Castings Building, under the rubric "Forum for Primary Secretaries": "Sick at Heart..."]

[Text] Nobody today is surprised by talk about purging the party—Communists talk about this among themselves almost without emotion. And the press sometimes writes very lightheartedly about it. Yet it is a very difficult subject!

SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA published an article entitled "Why Are the Vanguard Lagging Behind?" by O. Kazarov, secretary of our Ulyanovsk Party Oblast Committee [obkom] (5 August this year). Incidentally, it stated that party organizations contain many Communists who are unenterprising, inert, or simply unwilling to work. This cannot be disputed—there are many such Communists and, in my view, there are more and more of them. Criticism of the party has also increased among workers. Or rather it would be more correct to say criticism of those Communists who, by their actions, have besmirched their own authority and the honor of being a party member.

But let me return to the article. Oleg Vladimirovich believes that it is unlikely that these "unenterprising" people will be successfully brought into active political work, and therefore "it would be no tragedy if the party were to be substantially reduced." There is even a reference to Lenin: There were apparently party purges even under him.

Admittedly, there were purges. But there are purges and purges. Who was "purged" back then? And who is leaving the party now?

As a party committee member I have investigated applications to leave the CPSU for more than a year now. Were there perhaps some applications from Communist civil servants in this period? They were allegedly involved in so many unsuitable affairs during the years of stagnation that they might feel unworthy to be in the ranks of the Leninist party. I asked for a discussion on this point... No, there were no such applications. None of the party workers from the Brezhnev-Skochilov period (Skochilov was the former first secretary of Ulyanovsk CPSU Obkom) have publicly admitted their mistakes, others have just quietly retired to a "well-deserved rest."

So, unfortunately, the voluntary exodus from the CPSU at our plant is made up of so-called ordinary worker Communists. In their statements many write approximately the following: that they are sick and tired of seeing the party run by the same people from the party nomenklatura list and seeing them endlessly changing jobs. They also note that they see no change in social life and do not know how they could influence the resolution

of the urgent questions that concern people. Yet people make demands of us Communists.

Don't get the idea that I favor keeping "reluctant workers," idlers, and profit-seekers in the party. But let's take a close look at why some workers are applying to leave. They even include former activists: members of shop party bureaus, workers' control groups, and so forth. If things go any further we will be short of many people. Who will be left in the CPSU? Do we want to turn it into a party of civil servants?!

I have had to talk with many such "fugitives." What reasons do they give? Above all, that they have lost faith in the usefulness of their social activities. On discovering shortcomings, activists will be worried and make representations, but all this is in vain—their criticism and proposals will not be heeded; at best, people will only promise to do something or rectify something. Here is an example. When workers at the nonferrous castings building realized the benefit of economic accountability and were ready to embrace it, they came up against opposition from the administration. The leadership of the building and the plant made no secret of placing all kinds of obstacles in its way. Calculations were delayed and kept secret from the collective. Communists tried to move things forward, but they too were not heeded. The trade union committee and the party committee did not intervene, claiming that the people in authority could see more clearly how and where economic accountability should be introduced... From what quarter should people expect support in that case? And will that not convince them of the helplessness of the Communists whom they work alongside?

I think that some activists are prompted to leave the party by something else—the way in which cadre issues are decided. Most often they are decided in a narrow circle without due regard for the opinion of people, the collective, or the primary organization. Hence, on the one hand, the mistakes in cadre selection and placement; and, on the other hand, the lack of confidence shown by Communists and the collective in secretly nominated leaders. In an interview with the oblast newspaper party Obkom Secretary V. Baskakova noted: "The incompetence and inertia of some leaders are creating obstacles to perestroyka processes." We should further say why such people become leaders.

What do we Communists know about our leaders? How do they live, what ideas do they have, what are they currently working on? Is this a secret? But from whom are these leaders—party, soviet, and economic leaders—keeping their concerns and plans secret in the 5th year of perestroyka? How many appeals have there already been for attention to be paid to people, and yet most often leaders continue to be invisible. Everyone knows that this secrecy and alienation on the part of leaders is a result of the command system. But since we have decided to fight this system, we must see the fight through to the end. We must involve people in everything—in both their work and their everyday lives. What other mythical state interests could leaders keep away from people and their interests and needs? Ordinary Communists and nonparty people will only support leaders and party chiefs if they know them well and can see what they are actually doing and how they live.

These are the thoughts prompted when plant party committee sessions discuss these expulsion "matters" and when you then talk with those who have applied to leave the Leninist party. And I'll say bluntly: I'm sick at heart....

Soviet 'Inferiority Complex' Must End

PM1411141589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Nov 89 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Acceleration of Perestroyka. Toward a Qualitatively New State of Our Society, Toward the Building of Humane and Democratic Socialism"]

[Text] The dialectics of revolutionary perestroyka are such that its different stages present new problems on which public attention focuses. This demands a constant analysis of the actual situation and the introduction of amendments to our practical actions.

It is well known, that following the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum, our party set the task of accelerating our development, and this was a natural reaction to the years which the country had spent in stagnation. Later on, as life developed and analysis deepened, it became clear that many of the structures which prevailed during the years of stagnation required radical alteration. In these conditions, acceleration demanded the elaboration of a more thorough strategy, which we called perestroyka. Its great mission and purpose involve resolute rejection of the administrative edict system, the creation of new conditions for the implementation of comprehensive economic reform, transformation of the political system, and a spiritual renewal of society. The party formulated the concept of perestroyka and clearly defined its objectives: to achieve a qualitatively new condition in our society, to build a humane and democratic socialism.

The dynamics of perestroyka as an interim stage, whose duration is still difficult to determine, consist in the fact that the transformations which have been launched are beginning to acquire their own logic. The result of this is, as M.S. Gorbachev said at a recent sitting of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, that society at the present stage is again palpably sensing the need for an impetus toward acceleration—toward acceleration of the transformations which are already being implemented within the perestroyka framework. This applies to the economic and political reforms, to the implementation of the platform on interethnic relations, to the activity of the party itself as the initiator of perestroyka, and to many other fields and spheres of our life. The concept of perestroyka has come into direct contact with life along literally all avenues. In these conditions we need a skillful combination of long-term transforming activity

with the building of the new and the affirmation of positive principles in our life today.

Of course, the depth and soundness of perestroyka work are first and foremost. But people are right in feeling that, in many instances, we are lagging in implementing these transformations. This results in society's disorientation and disintegration. The result is a vicious circle: We need a breakthrough in practical politics, in the more resolute pursuit of transformations. But at the same time, their implementation comes up against many unsolved practical problems.

The party is now placing more emphasis on the need to adopt numerous urgent measures to solve the food and housing problems and to satisfy the consumer market. These measures should help us ease the tension and create an economic and moral environment for further advance. This is the only environment in which the urgent measures being adopted to solve many questions, including the most acute, will be effective. Hence the political task which the party brings to the foreground: to march resolutely forward, to create a new atmosphere of confidence and businesslike efficiency. Let us have fewer sundry abstract reflections, let us have less self-flagellation and less reveling in our own shortcomings. Let us have more confidence, realism, and optimism. And mainly a desire to apply more broadly in practice what has already been born out of perestroyka and offers opportunities for creative and constructive work.

We all are perfectly well aware that ours is a great country with a mighty economic potential and a sound and industrious people. But the lengthy stagnation and the poor return from the considerable efforts made by the people have engendered a kind of inferiority complex. It is important to overcome it as soon as possible, to act more decisively and more boldly, and then everything will work out. The party is not abandoning its critical examination of much that hindered and still hinders our advance. It is not in Soviet people's nature to give up in the face of hardships. We have all the objective grounds for confidence that, by energetically developing perestroyka, we will solve all our problems.

Perestroyka addresses man, his abilities, his labor, his spiritual qualities. Everything here is interdependent. No task facing party organizations and all Communists is more important that boosting people's spirits. Only thus will we be able to create the atmosphere which perestroyka needs in society—an atmosphere of creativity and labor.

Society is painfully emerging from the period of domination by the administrative edict system. It is emerging with difficulties, despite the fact that new economic methods of management are being intensively developed. So far, however, the two seem to somehow coexist in many cases. This interim period cannot be allowed to drag on. So it is also essential meanwhile to accelerate the development of new methods of economic management, of new forms of our social life.

There are people who recommend a return, at least temporarily, to the old system's methods. But such advice is dangerous. There can be no return to the old system, just as there can be no return to yesterday. It is necessary to bring new methods and new forms of work more quickly into operation. Then we will be more successful in overcoming the difficulties of the interim period. Of course, every process has its own stages which cannot be leapt over. But there is no need to "hover" in these leaps; what we need is to move more quickly from one stage to the next and thus cut short the interim period.

Nowadays there is much speculation alleging that we are moving too slowly. This may be so in some cases. So the situation must be analyzed in greater depth. But the party is firmly against demands for all stages to be leapt over in one single leap, thus arriving immediately at our society's new state. Things like this do not happen in real life. Ill-considered and hasty leaps forward may also push society backward. History will never forgive us for such experiments. The party is therefore in favor of dogged, intensive, stage-by-stage work and—simultaneously—in favor of its acceleration. Life demands the deepening of the concept of perestroyka and its implementation on the basis of everything positive that it has already "produced," on the basis of the experience accumulated by the party and the people in the recent past.

The Soviet people are committed to socialism. They know that, through perestroyka, society will achieve the solution of urgent problems and the fuller implementation of the socialist idea. Today we all sense the innovative nature and the scale of the transformations being implemented in the country.

The party is approaching its 28th congress. The preparation for it must ensure the creation of a new atmosphere in society and the party's renewal.

Of course, this demands a lot of intensive work. All front-ranking forces must join in this work. Many party organizations need to come out of a state of shock. The party's word and its organizational and ideological activity acquire exceptional importance now, when far-reaching economic and social processes are spreading, when an ideopolitical struggle is being waged around key problems of social development, when debate within the party itself is gathering pace. The CPSU, loyal to Lenin's traditions of being with the masses and in the thick of the masses, must assert itself as our society's genuine vanguard at the stage of perestroyka. This will determine to a decisive extent the success and the acceleration of perestroyka.

State Bank Warns Against Forged Bills

LD1311140989 Moscow TASS in English 1204 GMT 13 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 13 TASS—The State Bank and the Foreign Economic Bank of the USSR have lately

received a number of applications concerning so-called pink (blue, white) bills of exchange of various denomination that had been allegedly issued by the State Bank in Soviet roubles and can be presented for payment, including in hard currencies.

The USSR State Bank states that neither it nor the foreign economic bank, nor any other Soviet banking and financial institutions have ever issued at their instructions such bills either in the USSR or abroad.

The State Bank and other banking and financial institutions in the Soviet Union cannot act as guarantors of these counterfeit bills and bear no responsibility connected with any transactions involving these bills.

The State Bank warns parties cooperating with Soviet organisations about the unlawfulness of any transactions involving bills of exchange, pink or any other colour, expressed in Soviet roubles.

Thinking Behind New Draft Law on Leave Explained

PM1511092589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "At the USSR Council of Ministers and the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions (AUCCTU)"]

[Text] The USSR Council of Ministers and the AUCCTU submitted a draft Law "On Leave" for the USSR Supreme Soviet's examination on 10 November.

Along with the draft Law on Pension Provision for USSR Citizens, which has been submitted for nationwide discussion, the new Law on Leave which has been prepared essentially constitutes the second very important step taken to tackle specific socioeconomic problems in the country. It affects the interests of more than 130 million workers, employees, kolkhoz members, and other people engaged in socially useful labor.

The preparation of the draft was carried out with the active participation of trade union organs, ministries, and departments of the USSR, the councils of ministers of union republics, scientific research organizations, and many labor collectives of enterprises and organizations. The uniform principles for forming the new draft Law on Leave, irrespective of forms of ownership and economic management, were drawn up on the basis of a broad exchange of opinions. The following figure among the main criteria: A link with labor contribution, encouragement of highly productive labor in the light of its nature and conditions, and the granting of additional social safeguards to working women, juveniles, and invalids.

Fundamental changes are made to labor leave, and it is planned to increase its minimum length. To strengthen the link between leave and a working person's labor contribution it is proposed to increase basic leave as overall length of service increases.

Additional leave forms an important element in the system of leave allowing the specific conditions of the work place to be taken into account. Its incentive value varies. It is to be granted for work in hazardous and difficult working conditions, for work of a special nature, and for work in the regions of the Far North and equivalent locales.

Substantial benefits are provided for people working in unfavorable conditions, above all in the coal industry, the chemical industry, metallurgy, and transport.

A new form of leave—social leave—is being introduced in order to create more favorable conditions for combining motherhood with women's active involvement in work, to strengthen the family, and to receive education and carry out creative work.

It is planned to substantially expand the rights of enterprises and organizations in setting specific lengths of leave for hazardous and difficult working conditions and providing workers with incentives for high achievements and carrying out specially important and specially complex work.

The draft law reflects the rights of union and autonomous republics and local soviets to tackle questions connected with leave based on their social, demographic, natural, climatic, national, and other features.

It is proposed to implement the law in stages, starting 1991.

Start Date for Contempt of Court Law Slated

PM1511110789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

["USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution On the Introduction of the USSR Law 'On Liability for Contempt of Court'"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet **resolves**:

That the USSR Law "On Liability for Contempt of Court" shall go into effect on 1 December 1989. M. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Moscow, Kremlin, 2 November 1989.

Contempt of Court Law Published

PM1511091589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

["USSR Law on Liability for Contempt of Court"]

[Text] Article 1. Intervention in the resolution of court cases

Any form of influence on judges or people's assessors for the purpose of obstructing the comprehensive, complete, and objective examination of a specific case or of securing an unlawful judicial outcome—shall be punishable by corrective labor for a term of up to 1 year or a fine ranging from R300 to R1,000.

The same actions committed through the use of official position—are punishable by deprivation of liberty for a term of up to 3 years or by corrective labor for a period of between 1 and 2 years.

Article 2. Threat to a judge or people's assessor

The threat of murder toward a judge, the threat of violence or destruction of property toward a judge or people's assessor and likewise their close relatives in connection with the administration of justice by a judge or people's assessor—shall be punishable by deprivation of liberty for a period of up to 2 years or corrective labor for the same period.

Article 3. Insulting a judge or people's assessor

Insulting a judge or people's assessor in connection with their activity in the administration of justice—shall be punishable by corrective labor for a term of up to 1 year or a fine of up to R300.

Article 4. Nonexecution of a court decision

The deliberate nonexecution by an official of a decision, verdict, ruling, or resolution of a court or prevention of their execution—shall be punishable by a fine of between R300 and R1,000.

Article 5. Contempt of court

Contempt of court expressed in the deliberate refusal to appear in court by a witness, injured party, plaintiff, or defendant or refusal by the aforementioned or other citizens to accept the instruction of the presiding officer or expressed in the violation of procedure during a court session and likewise the commission by anyone of actions demonstrating clear contempt for the court or court rules shall entail administrative punishment in the form of administrative arrest for a period of up to 15 days or a fine of up to R100.

Article 6. Preventing a people's assessor from appearing in court

The prevention by an official on any pretext of the appearance of a people's assessor in court for the execution of his duties shall entail administrative punishment in the form of a fine of up to R100.

Article 7. Failure to take measures on an intermediate order (resolution) of a court or on the report of a judge

Failure by an official to examine an intermediate order (resolution) of a court or the report of a judge or failure to take measures to eliminate the violations of the law indicated therein and likewise a late response to an intermediate order (resolution) or report shall entail administrative punishment in the form of a fine of up to R100.

Article 8. Procedure for the institution of proceedings for contempt of court

Criminal proceedings for offenses covered by articles 1-4 of the present Law shall be instituted in accordance with the union republics' law of criminal procedure.

Administrative punishments for violations of the law covered by articles 5-7 of the present Law are imposed by the judge in the manner laid down by the law of the union republics.

The law of the union republics may also stipulate liability for other actions providing evidence of contempt of court. M. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.
Moscow, Kremlin, 2 November 1989.

TV Chief Editor on Replacement for Vremya Program

PM1511090989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 7

[Interview with Eduard Sagalayev, chief editor of Central Television's Main News Editorial Office, conducted by S. Dvigantsev under the "Central Television Direct Line" rubric: "Seven Days at the End of the Week"—time and place not indicated]

[Text] The "7 Days" program will be going out instead of the usual "Vremya" broadcast at 2100 hours Sunday. The first edition will be conducted by Eduard Sagalayev, chief editor of Central Television's Main News Editorial Office, who is well known to viewers through the 12th Story program.

[Dvigantsev] Eduard Mikhaylovich, is Vremya being pensioned off?

[Sagalayev] No, the new program will be a kind of television summary of the week's events. Vremya will stay in its weekly broadcasting slot, except for Sunday. Seven Days is, of course, different in many ways from previous news programs. It will run for 60-75 minutes. Seven Days will be conducted by commentators. We expect quite a semantic impact from the new news format. The phenomenon of viewing perception is that news read in an impassive tone creates in the television viewers' mind the impression of a definitive official judgment. We, however, are proposing discussion and the exchange of ideas, even directly opposed ones. Journalist commentary is naturally more appropriate here.

If the television broadcasts were to be provided with slogans, I would preface the new program with "Let's Think Together." The principles of putting 7 Days together and selecting its material are dicatated by the difficult political situation itself. We will show the week's most important events in the country and the world by developing and analyzing them, investigating the causes, and giving as far as possible forecasts of likely changes. This represents a new quality of news.

[Dvigantsev] What is planned for the first edition?

[Sagalayev] Analysis of the events taking place in the GDR and detailed study of the problem is being prepared by V. Mostovoy, the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting's [Gosteleradio] own correspondent in Berlin.

There will be a television linkup between Ostankino and Sytykvar in which the leaders of strike committees, striking and working miners, and the directors of mines in the Pechora Coal basin will take part. I think the discussion will be of fundamanmetal importance. It is time the demarcation line was drawn between a justified strike and economic sabotage.

We have invited the philosopher A. Tsipko to take part in the program. The topic of our dialogue will be the anxieties and concerns of modern society as formulated in the slogans which people flourish on the squares and in the streets.

There will be a space linkup session and cosmonauts Serebrov and Viktorenko will describe the results of an experiment carried out as part of the global scientific program "Man and the Biosphere." Television viewers will be able to see for themselves through actual examples the dirrect link that exists between the work carried out in orbit and our planet's future.

A block of items on interethnic relations is planned.

We want leading political experts to give their forecasts of the upcoming meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and George Bush.

[Dvigantsev] But won't viewers see Sunday's news in the new program?

[Sagalayev] We will certainly be showing it. There will also be sports and cultural news. I would remind you that it is a news program in which last-minute changes are possible. We are event-driven.

[Dviganstev] Eduard Mikhaylovich, the work of USSR Supreme Soviet committees and commissions, in which basic lawmaking takes place, is unknown to the public at large. Will you be showing it in your new program?

[Sagalayevb] We intend to, respecting the basic requirements—the significance of the topic and the open nature of its discussion by people's deputies.

[Dvigantsev] Last question: Who makes 7 Days?

[Sagalayev] I can tell you without any exaggeration that it is the brainchild of the whole editorial office. And the team preparing the edition includes my deputy, Oleg Dobrodeyev; editors Tatyana Mitkova and Yekaterina Aleksandrova; directors Yelena Pozdnyak and Elvira Rakhimova; and a large collective. Central Television journalists will take turns to conduct it. The second edition will be prepared by political observer Aleksandr Tikhomirov.

PRAVDA Reporter Banned From Chelyabinsk Forum

PM3110124589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Oct 89 Second Edition p3

[Own correspondent V. Cherepanov dispatch: "They Refused..."]

[Text] Chelyabinsk—A constituent conference of interregional democratic organizations has been held in Chelyabinsk. It was announced at a rally held by the Chelyabinsk People's Front under the slogan "The Consolidation of All Democratic Forces Is the Guarantee of the Irreversibility of Perestroyka" that representatives of 70 different informal movements and organizations from 50 cities in the country and eight union republics turned up to take part.

The conference organizers could not conceal their disappointment: The composition of delegates proved to be less representative than expected and could not compare even with the Leningrad conference which had adopted the decision to create this organization. There was nothing surprising about this, however. As is well known, not even half of the delegates voted for the contradictory draft resolutions of the new social movement which were proposed in Leningrad. But the aforementioned documents have been broadly circulated among enterprises and institutions in the oblast despite this.

I did not get to attend the conference myself. The day before it opened I telephoned L. Subbotina, a member of the organizational committee and People's Front coordinator, and asked how and where I could be accredited. Her answer was straight to the point:

"We do not intend to invite PRAVDA."

Why this discrimination? It seems that the press organ of the CPSU Central Committee does not report on the activity of such organizations in the way their leaders would like. For this reason the resolution adopted by the conference harshly ostracizes PRAVDA and even declares its correspondent to be persona non grata. Maneuvers of this kind do not tie in very well with the principles of democracy, pluralism, and freedom of speech so loudly trumpeted by the leaders of this newly-fledged organization.

Media Chief Views Moscow Radio Changes

PM3110145989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 7

[Interview with A. Plevako, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, by correspondent A. Ostalskiy: "New Voices on Familiar Airwave"; first paragraph is editorial introduction; date and place of interview not specified]

[Text] Our newspaper has already spoken recently about the history and achievements of Soviet radio broadcasting to foreign countries (IZVESTIYA No 294) to celebrate its 60th anniversary 29 October. But what is

the nature of the external broadcasting service today, what is the purpose of the changes taking place in its work? Our correspondent asked A. Plevako, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, these questions.

[Plevako] The external broadcasting network is a system of radio services broadcasting programs to 160 countries and areas of the world in 77 languages... The total broadcasting time is approximately 300 hours a day. In short, the Soviet foreign broadcasting network is the world's biggest foreign radio station. We think that approximately 100 million people across the globe listen to us.

[Ostalskiy] If it is not a secret, how much does the external broadcasting service cost?

[Plevako] More than R150 million a year. Admittedly, most of this money is used to pay for the services of the Ministry of Communications, which provides us with transmitting equipment.

[Ostalskiy] Aleksandr Sergeyevich, your service was founded as a means of ideological struggle. What about now? What are the considerable state funds used for?

[Plevako] We were, certainly, an instrument of the cold war. We struggled, defamed, and exposed. We believed in the principle "enemies will only say bad things about you, so only say good things about yourself," and that is why our remarkable achievements were glorified for days on end but later we frequently read in letters: "We don't believe you very much..." But the world has changed and mankind has entered a new phase. We too have changed. I would like to avoid big words, but I believe nonetheless that today the Soviet external broadcasting service is working for the sake of mutual understanding, peace, stability, and the survival of the human race. Our observers are accustomed to voicing their personal viewpoint.

In the past we could only dream of the KGB chairman, the defense minister, the chairman of the Council of Ministers, and other leaders speaking on our programs. Comparatively recently M.S. Gorbachev and A.I. Lukyanov gave interviews specially for us. All this, of course, works to ensure our radio's prestige and popularity. We have also interviewed such well-known people as Boris Yeltsin and Academician Sakharov. Nor did we need to seek any authorization to do so.

[Ostalskiy] All the same, is there really no news that you find awkward? For instance, the dramatic events in socialist countries—how rapidly do you "react" to them?

[Plevako] Immediately. Of course, there are difficulties: We do not like, say, to harm friendly countries. But we must not hide our heads in the sand like ostriches. We must report events just the same, but this can be done tactfully, for instance, by means of press reviews and so on. Take, for instance, the recent tragic events in China; we found an opportunity to report and even comment on everything immediately and say that we reacted with pain to what happened, just as we did to what happened in Georgia.

[Ostalskiy] A funny caricature covered the Western press recently: A housewife in one socialist country was overtly watching a Western television program, while her husband was doing something furtively, hiding in the far corner under a blanket... "Shh," the wife whispered to the visitors, "my husband is listening to Moscow Radio!" Do you think that idea is plausible?

[Plevako] It is, of course, an exaggeration. But by no means everyone everywhere liked or likes our programs, and they sometimes even cause irritation. I hope that the times are past when Soviet embassies abroad sent us angry dispatches every time any official expressed dissatisfaction with what he considered an unfortunate program or viewpoint.

[Ostalskiy] Has anyone ever jammed Moscow Radio, as we did until recently with foreign "voices"?

[Plevako] No, they haven't. It is a good thing that we have also abandoned these methods. However, the United States, for instance, had no theoretical need of jamming. It turned out historically that mediumwave and UHF broadcasting developed there and shortwave band receivers are uncommon, so they are more costly and few people buy them. We mainly broadcast on shortwave—otherwise we would not "reach" America or other far-off countries. That is why our countries were in an unequal position in this respect. M.S. Gorbachev even raised this question during his talks with R. Reagan. But the situation is now changing for the better: We have held talks with the U.S. "Public Broadcasting System" public radio station, and we are hoping that it will begin to relay our broadcasts as of the new year on the U.S. airwaves. That station's broadcasts are intended for the highly-educated, elite listener, and it has an audience of approximately 12-15 million people.

Views of New Novosibirsk Leader Solicited

PM1411154989 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 12 Nov 89 Second Edition pp 1,3

[Interview with V.P. Mukha, first secretary of Novosibirsk CPSU Oblast Committee, by V. Ivanitskiy in Novosibirsk 30 October: "Without Illusions and Disappointments"; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Excerpts] It has already been announced that a CPSU oblast committee [obkom] plenum was held 30 October in Novosibirsk to examine an organizational question. The election of the first secretary was carried out on a multiple-candidate basis. After extensive discussion at party organizations 10 candidacies were submitted for this post. In the light of withdrawals of candidacies and discussion of the candidates' platforms, the members of the CPSU obkom put four names on the secret ballot

paper. Vitaliy Petrovich Mukha was elected first secretary of the CPSU obkom by an absolute majority—receiving 91 out of 131 votes.

Our correspondent V. Ivanitskiy met him straight after the plenum. [Passage omitted].

[Mukha] I am convinced that only an improvement in working people's material position will ultimately introduce constructive principles into many political processes. You may think me a relic of the era of stagnation but I do not consider universal indignation over empty shelves to be evidence of the politicization of the masses.

[Ivanitskiy] I realize now why the so-called "Program-130"—the program whereby industrial enterprises offer aid to dying villages and hamlets in Novosibirsk Oblast—is associated with your name.

[Mukha] It was not my idea, it was, as the saying goes, in the air. But I was indeed, to use a grandiose phrase, entrusted with its implementation. So I saw for myself where the thread between good, progressive party and government decisions and real life was snapping. Today no one would argue that our totally ravaged countryside must be set on its feet. But when we raised the question of doing this using our own funds and by the efforts of industrial enterprises, there was definite lack of understanding among both plant leaders and collective workers. Now approximately 150 of the oblast's industrial enterprises are involved in the "Program-130." Banks and supply organizations have joined in. More than R20 million have been collected and a great deal is being constructed in the countryside at cost price. Everyone has finally realized that no one but we ourselves can help CPSU decisions on agriculture to take the form of concrete actions. I am sure that by 1995 Novosibirsk's livestock units, which are on their last legs today, will be restored to full peasant activity.

[Ivanitskiy] Vitaliy Petrovich, these approaches may indeed be considered a step backward. We talk everywhere about separating the functions of party and soviet organs, but you are in effect refuting this thesis and urging us to delay it. Is that not the case?

[Mukha] You can only appeal to common sense today. That is another professional lesson which I have clearly understood over the last year. No, I am by no means denying the avowed principle but I believe that it requires some amendments both of a theoretical and of a practical nature.

First, let us define our concepts and project them toward objective reality. What does "separating the functions of party and soviet organs" mean under today's real conditions wherein we are urging the soviets to seize power? If we think it over, the situation provokes dyarchy. Moreover, a third source of power—ministerial power—exists alongside the avowed autonomy of industrial enterprises and the departmental structures of their subordination which have remained in force.

How are political processes proceeding in this situation? As a rule, in those areas where people are interested in progress, party and soviet organs join forces and combat the departments, spurring on directors and labor collective councils to good deeds, holding them strictly to account, and appealing to their conscience. Such approaches have certainly been in operation before now, in the 5th year of perestroyka. Not because we are all such complete illiterates and lack general culture. It is a question of enforced actions in the specific conditions of our state which is not yet a rule-of-law state.

That is why, when people talk about the dialectics of relations between the party and the soviets, one should not disregard tactics. If we proceed on the basis of the perestroyka strategy, I believe that all power should in future be transferred to the soviets at local level. But that is precisely the crux of the matter—transferred rather than shared out in any way. This future will happen as soon as people's deputies elaborate and establish the legal mechanisms for this act—mechanisms that take into consideration all the diversity of vital ties.

[Ivanitskiy] During the discussion of the possible candidacies for the post of first secretary of the CPSU obkom, the oblast's Communists made many proposals about changing the usual election procedure, including direct elections of the oblast's party leader.

[Mukha] Yes, there was no shortage of proposals, including those that contravened the current CPSU Statutes. My opinion is that the main thing is not to forget what Communists said. We must analyze comprehensively how the oblast party organization has lived throughout this fortnight and glean everything that is of use for our future work. Don't misunderstand me, I would least of all like to make lavish assessments now of our recent experiences. One thing is clear—we must create a procedure for electing party leaders of any rank that considers the opinion of every Communist. How can this be done? By direct elections? Or is this possible in a different way—by giving existing mechanisms new substance? Time will tell.

[Ivanitskiy] Vitaliy Petrovich, of the ideas you have voiced, there are very many that are not popular in society today. You voiced them when you presented your election program on television. Were you not afraid of failure —for a politician must be popular, that is an inalienable quality of a professional politician.

[Mukha] Well, first, I am not quite a politician. To be honest, I don't think it's very hard to become popular today. The years of lack of dissent have simplified this procedure in the extreme. Now that the floodgates of glasnost are open, it suffices to employ the well-known gentleman's maxim of a popular politician in the time of perestroyka: Oppose the party's leading role, mention apparatus benefits and privileges (even if you yourself enjoy them), demand the direct election of the president (general secretary), accuse any party leaders near or far of unscrupulousness, stress that you have never believed in

anything—and it's in the bag: You are already popular. To ensure that your popularity doesn't wane (for you aren't doing anything specific), announce at rallies and in interviews from time to time that you are being persecuted by the apparatus.

Whereas, irony aside, I would like always to be an honest party man.

It is very difficult for a professional politician with self-esteem to become popular today, since the way to popularity does indeed lie through concrete actions.

[Ivanitskiy] In themselves your arguments about professionalism, the tactics and strategy of perestroyka, and the party's real niche in present and future life have somehow brought me to the question of the 28th CPSU Congress. Although the range of questions to be discussed there has already been determined, nonetheless what is your opinion on this score?

[Mukha] I do not quite like the agenda that was ratified by the CPSU Central Committee plenum or, more correctly, the first question on the agenda. I think it was formulated in an unclear fashion. I would have proposed the following version: "The Political Concept of the Perestroyka of Soviet Society: Tactics, Strategy, Final Goal."

That approach would have done all of us credit as professional politicians above all. It would be worth singling out at the congress a range of political problems brought about by perestroyka that require long-term study.

I include among them the party's position in conditions of a rule-of-law state, the prospects for a possible multiparty political system in society, and the question of classes: It is also time to investigate the concept of communism, which today people either bashfully keep quite about or drag through the mire.

Defining the CPSU's positions on all these questions will only help to establish many many party officials' professional stature. It will be merely easier in human terms and "left-wingers" will cease to wake up as "right-wingers" and fall asleep as "lobbyists." There will be a situation where the real supporters and enemies of the political concept of perestroyka will become clear. Moreover, I am prepared to argue with anyone you like that there will be far more of the latter among the various troublemakers. During the short time that I worked in the apparatus I saw for myself that its present restraint on many questions is often attributable not to the apparatchiks' notorious conservatism but to their bitter experience of shying from side to side.

But at present I think we should gird ourselves with presence of mind and professional dignity rather than be disappointed in what we have described as perestroyka—whatever difficulties a party official has today. I believe we must prize our achievements and be closer to the people and their everyday concerns.

Despite the diversity of everyday, political, or any other problems you like, the mechanisms for resolving them are universal and are suitable for all stages and phases of perestroyka—namely, the formulation and assessment of problems, the elaboration of the means of resolving them in conditions of real socialism and a one-party system, and the solution itself. With this in view we have already democratized everything apart from the last link, which today requires albeit measured but autocratic support from the party apparatus for as long as there is no state, no legal support. We must embark on this in an intelligent and, if you like, professional fashion. As the saying goes, Don't judge severely, judge fairly.

Lithuanian Party Official Views 'Radical Renewal'

LD1411142089 Vilnius TIESA in Lithuanian 26 Oct 89 p 2

[Interview with Justas Vincas Paleckis, chief of Ideology Section, Central Committee, Lithuanian Communist Party, by Terese Pazusiene, entitled: "Justas Vincas Paleckis, Chief, Ideology Section of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party: 'I Am Hoping For A Radical Renewal,'"—date and place not given]

[Text] [Pazusiene] In a 4 June interview with TIESA you were the first among Central Committee Lithuanian Communist Party apparatus staff who dared to suggest that postponement of a party congress would be— a mistake. Today we already know the scheduled date of the congress. How would you appraise the ground that has been covered?

[Paleckis] At that time I really didn't think everything could take place so swiftly and could turn out so well. Progress has been monumental. I say this knowing how great the opposition was. Just a few weeks ago, in this same building where we are conversing presently, only a minority was in favor of a congress during certain discussions. That constituted a total misinterpretation of the situation. It is impossible to stop with one hand the stream that has been given impetus by a party bent on restructuring. Not everyone was capable ot understanding this in June, however failure to currently comprehend this is tantamount to failure to comprehend reality.

[Pazusiene] Could this period have been more fruitful?

[Paleckis] Undoubtedly. Paragraph five of the Lithuanian Communist Party's 23rd Plenum of 24 June has been implemented and is being implemented quite belatedly, even now. We should have prepared all program-related documents—if not in August then at least by September. Congress groups should have commenced activity long ago. The criticisms by participants at the 21st plenum are totally well-founded.

[Pazusiene] Why did this happen? Is it due to the fact the party lacks independence or because a sufficient influential majority portion of its apparatus is suffering from inertia?

[Paleckis] The Lithuanain Communist Party has been independent for a year already—since the 24th Plenum of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party, when Algirdas Brazauskas was elected as its first secretary. At that point, blind, servile submissiveness and obedience came to an end. From that point onward no Moscow directive is accepted without deliberation: implemented if appropriate, rejected if inappropriate. No representative has been greeted as a superior. The Lithuanian Communist Party currently determines its own political course of action. Everyday, it consolidates party independence even more and the congress will only give it form.

[Pazusiene] Is it possible to state, that in the Communist Party headquarters, congress proponents are currently total victors?

[Paleckis] I am not totally sure, although it is has already become totally apparent, that there exists no other path and therefore any further discussions are no longer serious. Also, generally speaking, enough of holding discussions between four walls, where everyone is hermetically sealed in, where no one reaches openness, where totally unrealistic matters that might lead Lithuania into a total impasse are proposed.

[Pazusiene] We are always in fear of something: Moscow's strong arm, tanks, or something else. The newest fear—party fracture. What do you think about the fracture?

[Paleckis] A fracture is not useful, in a tactical sense. Neither a major one nor a small one. Morally speaking, however, it seems to me that it is unavoidable. I would be better if some were to drop out. That would provide an opportunity for decent communists of plural opinions and seeking a common goal, to unite more closely. No fears of this should exist.

[Pazusiene] Even though the plenum has already decided this discussions have not abated on the representational norms. What is your opinion on this?

[Paleckis] The question of whether it should be one delegate for every 50 of 200 communists is not a principal matter.

Let us consider, however: don't we have enough of stage and theatrical spectacles? A congress constitutes very difficult work, but it is not a contest among golden-tongued orators aiming attractive phrases at a large audience. It suffices to have a thousand intelligent individuals for adoption of wise decisions. It is important to elect just that caliber of individual to the congress.

[Pazusiene] What constitutes your greatest expectation from the congress?

[Paleckis] Like every other party member, I expect renewal—a radical renewal. A renewal, whereby, new individuals will be elected to the Central Committee. I expect the party to "disrobe" its bureaucrats. Who are these individuals after all who said that Sajudis had to be banned? Who are those who in 1988 were opposing long-overdue changes at the very top of the Lithuanian Communist Party? Who are those who declared that Lithuania did not require any economic independence, any statehood, or any party congress. They also declared that it did not require any Sajudis representative among its government organs. Those who look down upon the intelligentsia. Those who oppose everything with all their might and who have not yet taken any responsibility for unjust decisions. Such individuals act one way and say just the opposite, while peacefully continuing to occupy their offices and to preside preside at meetings. I believe the congress will place everything in its proper perspective.

[Pazusiene] Do you always consider yourself just?

[Paleckis] Indeed, no. I would place myself alongside those beset by doubt and searching, with difficulty, for answers to decisive questions. I would like it very much if people could trust politicians. This is why I don't conceal my position and try to make the same statements in closed meetings as well as in public.

[Pazusiene] Have you been already forgiven for Gotland?

[Paleckis] It was somewhat worse than I had expected: PRAVDA has written twice about it, incorrectly. Former Editor V. Afanasyev failed to retract it, even though he had promised to do so. I have been judged for that more than once and obviously continue to be judged now among Moscow's higher circles—in truth, this was done behind my back. I feel badly about this since these attacks had to be fielded by Algirdas Brazauskas in my stead. I would not be objective if I failed to add that many Central Committee CPSU and USSR Foreign Ministry officials did not reproach me in private conversations with them and even demonstrated their understanding of such a step.

I am pleased that, in spite of this, many renewed Lithuanian Communist Party's members and the people of Lithuania supported my signature. I would like to express my thanks for the letters of support that I have received and also for the resolutions of support adopted at meetings. In general, it is understandable that even at home I had the occasion to be met by a different reaction.

[Pazusiene] What basic principle guides your current activity?

[Paleckis] Not to hold on to my chair and to be capable of letting a younger, more gifted individual who thinks and acts in a new and creative manner take my place.

[Pazusiene] Thank you for the interview.

Agricultural

Livestock Wintering Causes Concern

Preparations Viewed

PM1311154989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

[Ye. Grigoryev and V. Konstantinov article: "On the Threshold of Winter. The Theme of the Survey: How Livestock Raisers Are Greeting the Cold Weather"]

[Text] In the mornings the frost on the trees and grass is a reminder that the cold weather is approaching. With this weather livestock unit workers have new concerns. They have to provide their livestock with high-quality rations, striving to ensure high productivity and the total safekeeping of young animals.

Many livestock unit collectives in the Tatar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, Stavropol Kray, and Lipetsk, Orel, and a number of other oblasts have prepared well for the winter. They have now obtained considerably more meat and milk than last year, and it may be hoped that there will be no disruptions in the future: There are good feed stocks.

However, judging by statistics, unfortunately in many regions the situation is not rosy. For instance, in the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic and Vologda, Kirov, and Perm Oblasts milk yields have declined even now and production has fallen. What will happen in winter if less feed is procured than required? Equally alarming signals are arriving from a number of oblasts in Kazakhstan, the Urals, and Siberia.

By and large the feed base throughout the country has not improved appreciably. Whereas silage stocks have increased somewhat, less hay, haylage, and grass meal have been procured. Growth rates in meat production must be doubled, for instance, by the end of the 5-year plan in order to achieve the indicators envisaged in the Food Program.

As we can see, the feed base is still not keeping up with these rates. Therefore this is by no means the time to cut back on increasing feed stocks. Especially since there are reserves for this. In some areas people ruthlessly burn straw. Waste from crop and vegetable growing is not used either.

It is not enough merely to store and preserve feed. The feed must be put to the correct use. Then the proper effect is obtained. But how much grain is fed in its pure state, unthreshed, and how much do we waste here? The figure is well known—up to 20-25 million tonnes. Yet the country has an acute grain problem, as was pointed out at the recent CPSU Central Committee Politburo sitting. Were it not for omissions by specialists and leaders at the local level, along with the backwardness of the mixed feed industry, this problem's acuteness would in many respects be relieved.

Nonetheless, the situation has improved at enterprises in the sector in a number of places. Plants have boosted the quality and increased the range and output of mixed feeds. But these are isolated instances. Most continue to confine themselves to merely mixing ingredients. Thereby dooming the economy of the agro-industrial complex and the country as a whole to pointless losses. Including of hard currency spent on feed grain procurement. The experience of progressive farms and enterprises shows that progressive methods of preparation boost the nutritional properties of mixed feeds by one-third. However, modern equipment is needed to obtain such mixtures. Such equipment is in short supply, although the situation is improving.

Thus, thanks to the efforts of local party, soviet, and economic organs in Kharkov, Novosibirsk, and Cherkassy Oblasts, a great deal has been done to improve techniques in livestock units. Compact units for the manufacture of mixtures have been created and are being successfully employed. Simple in design and reasonably priced, they are making it possible to sharply boost feed output and increase livestock productivity. Today, for instance, the "Kharkovchanka" unit is employed at livestock units not only in Kharkov Oblast, but also in many others. Nonetheless, things are not going too well with the production of this equipment. The USSR Ministry of Automotive and Agricultural Machine Building and other ministries, including the defense complex, can and must considerably improve livestock raisers' technical equipment this season.

For many years the average level of farms' feed supply has never topped 28 quintals of feed units per standard head of livestock when the requirement is for 34-40 quintals. Nor is the quality everything it should be. A considerable proportion of feed is unnutritious and in poor condition. For instance, livestock units store most of the hay in ricks rather than under cover. The thoughtless practice of enclosing silage mounds instead of laying the green matter in trenches is still carried out. This extravagance costs us dear. Losses of coarse and succulent feed sometimes amount to 30-40 percent. That is a reserve which does not require the expansion of sown areas or additional expenditure on seed and fertilizer.

The improvement of economic relations also promotes success. Premises in contract and lease collectives are prepared in good time for the winter and the equipment operates better. It is important for party organizations to help people obtain autonomy and a sense of being the master. It is not loud slogans that are needed here but ordinary humdrum work to master the kind of economic relations that cultivate a careful, thrifty master.

With the change in the planning system, many farms have reduced livestock numbers. Consequently, we must obtain a large return from the remainder in order to increase yields and weight gains. The capacities of personal subsidiary plots are considerable! Many rural soviets and farm leaders extensively practice the fattening of livestock by contract with the population.

provide subsidiary plots with young animals and feed, and help construct buildings. The concern pays off with an increase in milk and meat production and a marked improvement in the range of food available at local stores.

Milk Shortages

LD1411230689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 14 Nov 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; report by correspondenet Valeriy Golubev—identified by caption]

[Excerpt] [Valeriy Golubev—identified by caption] Hallo comrades: A difficult time has started for stock-breeders—wintering. I have here a review of the industry for the first 10 months and although there is a small increase of 2-3 percent of milk and meat, it is not encouraging, because in October, during the transition from pastoral to stall-keeping of the public herd in the country as a whole, 105,000 tonnes of milk was lost. Moreover, this occured in regions well supplied with feed, such as the central Chernozem Oblasts, Volga region, non-Chernozem region, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, not to mention the Transcaucasus where the farms managed to get a little over half their requirements of coarse and succulent feeds. The drought? Yes, but not that alone. In the South Urals, where the drought was fiercest, many did not even get seed but there's plenty of milk. [passage omitted]

Agricultural Report for 6-14 November Period

LD1511033789

[Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 6-14 november, unless indicated otherwise. Times of broadcast, given in GMT, are in parenthesis at the end of each item.

6 November
No relevant items

7 November.
Turkmen farmers have become the first to fulfill their year's task for sale of raw cotton to the state. More than 1.3 million tonnes of cotton has been delivered to procurement points, of which one-third is of the fine-fiber variety. (0304)

8 November.
Agricultural workers in Turkmenistan have fulfilled the year's plan for the sale of raw cotton to the state. A total of more than 1.3 million tonnes has been received. (1200)

9 November.

To date 5,129,654 tonnes of raw cotton have been delivered to procurement points and processing enterprises in Uzbekistan, according to the state statistics committee. [Tashkent Domestic Service in Russian 1310)

Considerably more than 5 million tons of raw cotton have been delivered to the procurement points and cotton processing plants now. The harvesting of cotton was carried out in an unprecedently short period in spite of extremly unfavorable weather conditions. The mechanizers picked with their combines around 70 percent of the harvest. (1430)

10 November.

The sugar beet harvest is in the Ukraine. At over 50 million tonnes, it is 6 million tonnes above the state order. (0500)

Syrdarya Oblast in Uzbekistan is today completing sale of cotton to the state. More than 700,000 tonnes of high-quality cotton has already been delivered to the reception points. (0500)

Altay livestock farmers have sold the state 20,000 tonnes more meat and 60,000 tonnes more milk this month than during November last year. (0700)

Collective and state farms in Stavropol Obalst have dispatched their 250,000th above plan tonne of sugar beet for processing. Each of the more than 41,000 hectares of sugar beet plantation has a yield of 300-306 quintals this year, 78 quintals above the level planned. (2230)

11 November

The tractor detachments of Kazakhstan have finished their work in the fields. They have carried out autumn ploughing on 17 million hectares. Five million hectares of bare fallows have been prepared for next year's harvest. The plan for ploughing across the republic as a whole has not been fulfilled. (0700)

12 November

Karalkalpakia has sold 360,000 tonnes of cotton to the state so far. (0500)

13 November

No relevant items

14 November

Surkhandarya Oblast, Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic, has laid in more than 300,000 tonnes of fine fiber cotton. (0300)